

717 725
L 56

THE
TROTSKY SCHOOL
OF
FALSIFICATION

PART ONE

Revolutionist League, U.S.A.

THE RED STAR PRESS
P.O. Box 67 Sta. D.,
New York

I N T R O D U C T I O N

Amongst the most insidious and subtle of the political myths which have deceived and paralyzed the working class and in particular its most advanced section, the class-conscious, revolutionary workers, is the story that Leon Trotsky led a Leninist struggle against the Stalinist reaction. For many years the Trotsky movement throughout the world, leaning upon this myth, has acted as the main center of attraction for the revolutionary workers who break subjectively with Stalinism and seek a new revolutionary movement, and to a lesser degree for some of those workers who in general move Leftward, but are repelled by the Stalin organizations. Upon falling into the Trotsky trap, these workers, who under a genuine Leninist leadership would have formed the kernel of a new Bolshevik movement, inevitably found themselves shunted directly and indirectly into support of Stalinism.

T H E B U L L E T I N has presented over a period of years a thorough and many-sided exposure of the pseudo-anti-Stalinist character of the Trotsky movement. As part of this work, T H E B U L L E T I N has run a section called THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION in which a large variety of the deceptions perpetrated by Trotsky and his lieutenants, the Cannons and Shachtmans, has been exposed. The present publication is a collection of articles originally published in THE BULLETIN in this section. Dealing in the main with the past of the Trotsky tendency, THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION has served as a supplement to the struggle against the Trotskyite leaders' present-day opportunist practices which T H E B U L L E T I N constantly bares. A scientific, organic understanding of the opportunist nature of the Trotsky movement requires a knowledge of its historical background as the source of its present-day reactionary policies.

While each article in this collection is a unit in itself, the series should be read consecutively, for the articles have been arranged in an historical order to provide political unity to the whole.

T H E B U L L E T I N will continue to present THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION as a feature in its forthcoming issues.

T H E B U L L E T I N

CONTENTS

Trotsky and the legend of Lenin's mantle	1
Who informed Stalin	4
Trotsky and Shachtman Versus history	7
Trotsky "teaches" party discipline	10
Trotsky's "advice" to the Russian workers	12
Shachtman fails to finish a story	14
How Trotsky "exposed" Stalin's Krestintern	16
History written to order	18
Shachtman as an "historian"	20
The political nature of the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc	23
Tricky phrases cannot hide the truth	26
Trotsky and Radek's line on China	28
The motives of Zinoviev and Kamonev	30
Enshrining Radek in the heart of the working class	33
Stalin's aide - a "fortune" for the workers	35
Shachtman's magic pen	38
The political morals of the Trotskyite leaders	39

T H E
T R O T S K Y S C H O O L O F F A L S I F I C A T I O N

T R O T S K Y A N D T H E L E G E N D O F " L E N I N ' S M A N T L E "

TROTSKY has asserted categorically that at every stage in the struggle of Lenin against Stalinism, "Lenin sought my support and found it" (Suppressed Testament of Lenin, p. 32). Trotsky further maintained that Lenin, incapacitated by illness, entrusted to him the leadership of the fight against Stalinism (See MY LIFE, pp. 482-3), and that he accepted this leadership and faithfully carried it out. Indeed, it is as the historic continuer of Lenin's proposed battle against Stalinism that Trotsky presented himself to the workers.

In one place in his autobiography (dated 1929), Trotsky stated that Lenin intended him to be the successor to Lenin's post of chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars:

"Lenin suggested that I think over the organization end of the question. He planned to create a commission attached to the Central Committee for fighting bureaucracy. We were both to be members. This committee was essentially to be a lever for breaking up the Stalin faction as the backbone of the bureaucracy, and for creating such conditions in the party as would allow me to become Lenin's deputy, and as he intended, his successor to the post of chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissaries." (MY LIFE, p. 479. Our emphasis.)

From Trotsky's statement we see that Lenin's intention to have Trotsky the successor to the post of chairman of the People's Commissars was intimately connected with Lenin's plan to give Trotsky the leadership of the fight

against Stalinism. Trotsky knew of this intention of Lenin's from his personal negotiations with him during the period of Lenin's illness in 1922-1923.

Amongst the party tops of that period this intention of Lenin's was quite well known. In 1924, Max Eastman, acquainted with some of the leaders of the already Stalinized party of the S.U., also learned of Lenin's intention. In his book, SINCE LENIN DIED, Eastman revealed this intention in addition to many facts about the Stalinist conspiracy to usurp power and to destroy Trotsky as a political power.

How remote Trotsky actually was from accepting Lenin's offer of conducting a fight against Stalinism is clearly shown by the fact that, as a gesture of what he himself termed peacemaking and conciliation toward the Stalin clique, Trotsky publicly repudiated all of Eastman's authentic exposures of Stalin and his gang of conspirators. Eastman's revelation that Lenin intended Trotsky as his successor to the post of chairman of the People's Commissars was amongst the facts denied by Trotsky in his slanderous assault on Eastman:

"Eastman is again wrong in asserting that Comrade Lenin offered me the post of chairman to the council of People's Commissars, and of the Council for Labour and Defence. I hear of this for the first time from Eastman's book." (L. Trotsky, Inprecarr, Sept. 3, 1925.)

Trotsky presents two contradictory,

Actually exclusive stories: one, that Lenin intended him for the post of chairman of the People's Commissars, and the other, flatly denying this. If the other must be a fabrication. In release of the Stalin clique of power- usurpation, Trotsky cast aside Lenin's plan of a fight against Stalinism and took to the road of cooperation with Stalinism. Buried beneath a heap of malicious abuse by Trotsky, Stalin's vital revelations could, of course, have no value to those honest workers who sincerely desired to destroy Stalinism. Lenin's anti-Stalinist plans, trampled upon by Trotsky, had to give way to the triumph of Stalinism. The post of chairman of the People's Commissars naturally went to one of Stalin's henchmen, Rykov. That Trotsky two and a half years after the end of Lenin's political life repudiated his designation as successor to Lenin's post of leadership, meant in effect his slandering of the Stalinist usurpation of Lenin's position.

Thus did Trotsky don Lenin's mantle!

In whitewashing his avoiding to stress Lenin's fight against Stalinism, Trotsky offered the following excuse:

"Independent action on my part would have been interpreted, or, to be more exact, represented as my personal fight for Lenin's place in the party and state. The very thought of this made me shudder." (NY LIFE, p. 482.)

"That restrained me was the fear that any sharp conflict in the ruling group at the time when Lenin was struggling with death might be understood by the party as a casting of lots for Lenin's mantle." (STRESS-TESTING OF LENIN, p. 32-33)

As first glance, this seems quite plausible. Careful investigation, however, reveals that these excuses are merely shrewd inventions designed to conceal the real situation.

In the first place, it was not independent action on Trotsky's part that was the essence of the matter, for

no independent action by Trotsky was required. Lenin himself took the independent step of preparing voluminous documents against Stalin as a basis for the fight against the bureaucratic usurpation of power. This renegade was effecting. Especially on the national question, Lenin provided Trotsky with detailed material which only had to be presented before the XII Party Congress in April 1923 as Lenin's -- (and not particularly Trotsky's) -- battle against the Stalin clique. Trotsky had merely to carry out Lenin's line. At the XII Party Congress, however, Trotsky took a very "independent" step, a step remarkably independent of Lenin. Trotsky lined up with the Stalin gang to suppress Lenin's anti-Stalinist documents on the national question. Further, independently of Trotsky, Lenin wrote the so-called Testament, in which he proposed the removal of the disloyal Stalin from the post of General Secretary. And again, Trotsky took an "independent" step, like that at the XII Congress. At the time of the XII Party Congress in May 1924, Trotsky stood together with the Stalin clique to suppress Lenin's "Testament".

We observe that Trotsky was not at all bashful about "independent" action. Unfortunately, all this "independent" action was against Lenin, and with Stalin. When Trotsky "explained" his failure to press Lenin's fight against Stalinism as a matter of avoiding "independent" action which might have been interpreted as casting lots for Lenin's mantle, he subtly distorted the entire history of his role in the rise of Stalinism. Trotsky's role was not a mere failure to fight Stalin. Trotsky's role was one of active sabotage of Lenin's proposed war against Stalinism. Trotsky's role was one of what he himself characterized as conciliation with the Stalin gang. (See his statement on Eastman, New International, Nov. 1924, p. 126), a conciliational, which proceeded on wholly Stalinist terms, for Trotsky's efforts at conciliation meant sabotaging Lenin's line against Stalinism. In brief, Trotsky's role was the attempted formation of a bloc with the Stalin clique, only the treachery of the double-crossing Stalin gang which was irrevoc-

ably bent on destroying the powerful political figure of Trotsky and replacing itself to supreme power. Rendering Trotsky an "Oppositionist." And as Trotsky was the sham "inheritor" of "Lenin's mantle," so he was, and could only be a sham "Oppositionist" to Stalinism, for in the epoch of the Stalinist conspiracy, to inherit "Lenin's mantle" meant in the first place to conduct a relentless war against Stalinism.

There is still another essential angle to this detail of Trotskyist history. It should be recalled that the documents entrusted by Lenin to Trotsky were directed primarily and in fact almost wholly against Stalin. "By taking the example of Stalin's policy," says Trotsky, "he (i.e., Lenin) wanted to expose to the party, and ruthlessly, the danger of the bureaucratic transformation of the dictatorship." (NY LIFE, p. 484.) "Vladimir Ilyich is preparing a bomb for Stalin at the congress." (Ibid., p. 482.) At that time (1922-1923) Stalin was a relatively insignificant figure in the Soviet Republic. "Stalin, beyond the narrow circle of the old Bolsheviks, was almost unknown," says Trotsky speaking of this period. (Ibid., p. 491).

Trotsky, on the other hand, was a man of colossal power and prestige. Trotsky pretends that if he had come forward on Lenin's line, this would have been interpreted as casting lots for "Lenin's mantle." Casting lots with whom -- with the unknown and insignificant Stalin? The notion that Trotsky is presenting Lenin's documents at the Party Congress and pressing Lenin's line would have been interpreted for Trotsky's casting lots with Stalin in for "Lenin's mantle" stands as amongst the most fantastic of all the inventions Trotsky has concocted to conceal his treachery. In the eyes of the masses, as a candidate for "Lenin's mantle," Stalin simply did not exist. No fight against Stalin, whatsoever, whether alone or in collaboration with Lenin, could possibly have been represented to anyone but a raving madman as a casting of lots between Trotsky and Stalin for "Lenin's mantle." Indeed, had Trotsky come forward with Lenin's documents, there would have been created a Lenin-Trotsky combination which would have utterly anni-

lated the relatively paltry Stalin. Nor is this merely our contention. Trotsky himself asserts that even alone, had he come forward representing a Lenin-Trotsky bloc, he could have defeated the Stalin gang:

"And what is more, I have no doubt that if I had gone forward on the eve of the twelfth congress in the spirit of a bloc of Lenin and Trotsky against the Stalin bureaucracy, I should have been victorious even if Lenin had taken no direct part in the struggle." (Ibid., p. 491).

The fact is, however, that Trotsky did not come forward. With victory for Leninism assured -- "I have no doubt" -- Trotsky preferred to sabotage Lenin's line and to side with the Stalin gang in an effort to establish a collective bureaucratic usurpation of power.

While Trotsky was collaborating with the Stalin clique, the latter was engaged precisely in an effort to present themselves to the masses as the beneficial successors of Lenin:

"The whole plan of the conspirators was that after they had murdered enough support in the organizations, they would be crowned legitimate successors to Lenin." (NY LIFE, p. 485.)

The success of the Stalinist conspirators in usurping the entire Leninist tradition was due to a major extent to Trotsky's abandonment of cooperating with Lenin and adoption of a policy of cooperating with the Stalinists.

All these facts must be kept in mind when reading Trotsky's alibi for failing to stand on Leninist grounds against the Stalinist conspirators. The assurance of victory over Stalinism which Trotsky claims, the fact that Stalin could not possibly have been presented to any sane person as a contender for "Lenin's mantle," the fact that Trotsky alone in the eyes of the overwhelming mass of the toilers was the logical inheritor of Lenin's mantle all prove the utter falsity of Trotsky's glib alibis. And finally, the fact that Trotsky's role was not merely one of throwing away a sure chance of victory because of excessive caution, but was one of active sabotage of Lenin's line is the key to the whole story of the myth of Trotsky as the inheritor of "Lenin's mantle." S. E. Benson

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

THE SO-CALLED LENIN TESTAMENT

From the major documentary evidence at the disposal of the revolutionary workers, it is only with the greatest difficulty that the picture of the Stalinist conspiracy for power can be reconstructed in its major and most important features. One of the essential components parts that enter into this picture is the so-called Testament of Lenin. Much confusion, deception and controversy has been woven around this notorious document in which Lenin laid down a clear-cut line of removing Stalin.

As we have learned from the few bits of information available, Lenin dictated this document for the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, held in April 1923. However, the world learned of Lenin's "will" long after the Twelfth Congress, and not from the leadership of the Russian Communist Party, which included Trotsky. In 1925, Max Eastman, an American journalist, a non-Marxist politically, brought this document to the attention of the workers. As is well known, the entire Stalinist leadership vigorously denied the existence of Lenin's "will." Trotsky attacked Eastman, setting categorically: "ALL TALK WITH REGARD TO A CONCEALED OR LIMITED 'WILL' IS NOTHING BUT A DESPICABLE LIE." (L. Trotsky, International Press Correspondence, September 3, 1925, #68, p. 1005. My capitals - G.M.)

The talk about the existence of the Testament persisted, nevertheless. Years later Trotsky himself published a pamphlet "The Suppressed Testament of Lenin." On page 12 of this pamphlet Trotsky tells the reader that only two persons in the beginning knew about the testament, Krupskaya and Lenin's secretary, Volodicheva. The document, Trotsky said, had been kept by Krupskaya under lock and key, and only after Lenin's death did she hand the testament over to the secretariat of

the Central Committee, which as we know was headed by the General Secretary, Stalin.

The so-called testament was written at two periods, separated by an interval of ten days: December 25, 1922 and January 4, 1923. At first only two persons knew of the document: the stenographer, M. Volodicheva, who wrote it from dictation, and Lenin's wife, N. Krupskaya. As long as there remained a glimmer of hope for Lenin's recovery, Krupskaya left the document under lock and key. After Lenin's death, not long before the thirteenth congress, she handed the testament to the secretariat of the Central Committee, in order that through the party congress it should be brought to the attention of the party for whom it was destined." (L. Trotsky, "The Suppressed Testament of Lenin," p. 12. My emphasis - G.M.)

The impression was created by Trotsky that none of the leaders had read the text of the document prior to Lenin's death, but that it was brought to the attention of the secretariat, headed by Stalin, after Lenin died.

Many years following Lenin's death, Trotsky in an amazing article entitled "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" -- an article which by the way has been, "strangely" enough, received in silence by Cannon, Sachman, Stamm and Oehler and completely ignored in their official publications -- of a sudden gave an entirely different version. It seems from this new version that Stalin had read the Testament while Lenin was still alive and was preparing to return to activity. It was the period of extensive bureaucratic machinations which Stalin and his allies, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others were carrying out throughout the Soviet Union. Lenin's return to political work would have

meant the death of Stalin's conspiracy for power and his position as a party leader. Stalin realized that his annihilation could be prevented only by Lenin's death:

"When Stalin first read the text he broke out into bilious rage against Lenin. The testament not only failed to terminate the internal struggle, which was what Lenin wanted, but enhanced it to a feverish pitch. Stalin could no longer doubt that Lenin's return to activity would mean his own political death. Only Lenin's death could clear the way for him." (L. Trotsky, Liberty, August 10, 1940, p. 24)

From the above statement it is clear that Stalin had read the Testament while Lenin was still alive, for he feared "Lenin's return to activity."

In his postscript to the Testament, Lenin very definitely and explicitly laid down a line for the removal of Stalin from his post. In the same article in Liberty, Trotsky relates that he, Zinoviev and Kamenev were informed by Stalin on a certain day "that Lenin had suddenly called him in and had asked for poison." (p. 24) Trotsky himself intimates that this story of Stalin's was a pure invention. Trotsky asks concerning Stalin's tale that Lenin had asked him for poison: -- "But did Lenin actually ask Stalin for poison? Was the whole version not invented by Stalin to prepare his alibi?" (Ibid.) Trotsky goes on to say that "Only a few days before, Lenin had written his pitiless postscript to the testament." (Ibid.) In other words, only a few days after Lenin had written his proposal to remove Stalin, the latter came around with a suspicious yarn about Lenin's "request" for poison.

With the publication of the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" Trotsky had to his "credit" three contradictory versions of the story of Lenin's Testament: -- 1) The 1925 version; all talk of the existence of the Testament "is a despicable lie!" 2) the 1932 version: the Testament existed and was authentic, but that it was at first

known to only two persons and that as long as there was a glimmer of hope for Lenin's recovery -- which hope Trotsky indicated in his obituary article on Lenin, existed until Lenin's very last day -- it was kept under lock and key by Krupskaya. The document was turned over to the secretariat, according to this version, in 1924, only after Lenin's death. Trotsky in this version definitely conveys the impression that the highest leaders, Stalin among them, and even Trotsky himself, became familiar with the text of the Testament not before, but after Lenin's death; 3) the 1940 and final version: Stalin read the Testament during Lenin's life. Significantly enough, according to this version, only a few days after the Testament was completed, Stalin proposed to "send" poison to Lenin.

There are certain vital questions which must be raised about this whole matter. On the one hand, Trotsky clearly indicates that Stalin read the Testament before Lenin's death which occurred in January 1924. On the other hand, Trotsky states that he himself first learned about the Testament only on May 22, 1924, i.e., after Lenin's death, at a meeting of the council of seniors of the Thirteenth Party Congress. Trotsky says: "It was here that the oppositional members of the Central Committee first learned about the testament, I among them." (The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, p. 12. My emphasis - G.M.) The question arises -- How did Stalin manage to read the testament before Trotsky? Is it possible that Krupskaya, who had the testament under lock and key, gave it to Lenin's enemy, Stalin, rather than to Trotsky to whom Lenin entrusted the fight against Stalin? Trotsky in My Life, p. 465, relates that the immediate cause of Lenin's breaking off all relations with Stalin was that, in trying to cut Lenin off from all sources of information, Stalin had been very rude to Krupskaya, who had a fairly good knowledge of Stalin's machinations and of the sharp antagonism between Lenin and Stalin, prefer to confide the text of the Testament to Stalin rather than to Trotsky? There are a few more legitimate

questions. When Trotsky, as he alleges, heard Stalin's suspicious proposal to "send" poison to Lenin, why did not Trotsky inform the people in Lenin's household of the possibility that a plot against Lenin's life was being hatched? Why did he not disclose to the Communist workers the character of the "poison consultation"? Stalin had held with him, Zinoviev and Kamenev? The whole "poison consultation," Trotsky indicates, was so extraordinary and bore such mysterious aspects, that the picture of it burned itself indelibly into Trotsky's mind and remained there vividly even in 1940: "I recall how extraordinary, enigmatic, and out of tune with the circumstances Stalin's face SEEMED TO ME THEN. A sickly smile was fixed on it, as a mask." (Liberty, August 10, 1940, p. 24. My capitals — G.M.) Yet, for sixteen years, Trotsky kept silent about the whole affair! And Cannon keeps silent about it even now.

Trotsky revealed at the so-called Dewey Commission that when Zinoviev and Kamenev joined him three years after these events in 1923, all the secrets of the Trika of Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin became known to him: "I must introduce, that after the split of Kamenev and Zinoviev from Stalin, all the secrets of the 'Trika' became known by me as an ally of Zinoviev and Kamenev." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 80. My emphasis — G.M.) What secrets of the Stalinist conspiracy did Trotsky take with him into the grave?

Let us make a brief survey of the relations of Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky in 1922-1923, in the light of the statements of Trotsky himself. In December 1922 Lenin prepared his "bomb" against Stalin on the National Question. In January 1923 Lenin wrote his postscript to the Testament proposing the removal of Stalin. A few days later Stalin consulted Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev on the question of "sending" poison to Lenin. Early in March 1923, Lenin declared his solidarity

with the Georgian anti-Stalinists, the Mdivani group, and made ready to demolish Stalin politically and organizationally. At the same time Lenin notified Trotsky not to make compromises with Stalin even on a correct line. To leave no shred of doubt as to how he felt toward Stalin, Lenin in a letter on March 6, 1923 broke off all relations with Stalin. Of what significance, therefore, was Trotsky's "strange" and "inexplicable" statement to Kamenev on the very day when Lenin broke relations with Stalin, of which Trotsky was immediately informed, that "I am against removing Stalin. . . ." (My Life, p. 485)?

There stands before the revolutionary workers a whole series of vital questions. In all his voluminous writings, in the eighteen years of the existence of Stalinism, Trotsky withheld the precise answers to these questions. The revolutionary workers will find a full answer to these and many other questions concerning the origin and rise of Stalinism and the precise character of each person's part in it, including Trotsky's, only when Stalinism is overthrown by the revolutionary proletariat. Meanwhile every revolutionary worker must strive to learn as much as possible about the true story of the Stalinist degeneration of the first workers state. They must not accept things on anyone's say-so, but must demand documentary proof. They must break through the conspiracy of silence by means of which Cannon, Shachtman, Ohler and the like strive to obscure and conceal the real essence and course of the Stalinist conspiracy, and especially Trotsky's part in it. The revolutionary workers must understand why Cannon, Shachtman and Co. remain silent about Trotsky's article, "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" and dodge the issues and questions it raises. Every sincere fighter for the cause of the proletariat must press forward to learn the entire truth despite the Cannons, Shachtmans, and Ohlers.

George Marler
December 18, 1940

When Lenin dropped out of the political picture, in 1922-23, the bureaucratic degeneration of the Russian Communist Party took definite shape. However, when the Trotskyites "explain" what happened during these crucial years, they tell different stories at different times and on different occasions. For instance: When did the Stalin clique gain control over the policies of the C.P.S.U.? - Which was the last Bolshevik congress and which was the first Stalinist congress of the Russian Party?

Posing as the genuine anti-Stalinist Bolsheviks, Trotsky and his aides must occasionally give some specific facts and dates bearing upon the rise of the Stalinist reaction. Trotsky tells the workers that the Twelfth Congress, which took place in April 1923, was the last Bolshevik congress, and that all subsequent congresses, beginning with the Thirteenth, were bureaucratic affairs.

"In reality, the last congress of the Bolshevik Party took place at the beginning of 1923, the Twelfth Party Congress. All subsequent congresses were Stalinist congresses." (Leon Trotsky, "The Great History of the Soviet State," p. 25. Our emphasis)

Let us be clear about this. If the Twelfth Congress was, as Trotsky asserts, the last Leninist Congress, then according to Trotsky there were only seven Leninist Congresses held by the R.C.P. after the overthrow of the Tsar. The Eleventh Congress in March 1922, the Tenth in March 1921, the Ninth in March 1920, Eighth in April 1919, Seventh in March 1918 and the Sixth Congress of the R.C.P. in August 1917. This is a total of six Leninist congresses. Adding the Twelfth Congress of April 1923 as Trotsky does makes a total of seven Leninist congresses. But Trotsky's aide, Shachtman, gives a total of eight Bolshevik

Congresses from the period of the overthrow of the Tsar because he goes one congress further than Trotsky by including the Thirteenth Congress of May 1924 in the congresses that he says were Bolshevik. The first Stalinist congress, according to Shachtman was therefore the Fourteenth Congress:

"In the revolutionary period, between the overthrow of the Tsar and the death of Lenin, the party held eight regular party congresses (and seven conferences). The Stalinist record is quite different. The first real post-Leninist congress was the 14th, in December 1925; . . ." (The New International, January 1938, p. 9. Our emphasis)

The reader should note that when Shachtman calls the Fourteenth Congress the "first real post-Leninist congress" he does not mean it merely in a chronological sense, i.e., in the sense that it was the first held after the death of Lenin. The first Congress held after the death of Lenin was the Thirteenth Congress in May 1924. Lenin died in January 1924. By "first real post-Leninist congress" Shachtman means that the Fourteenth was the first real Stalinist congress.

Trotsky and Shachtman are obviously in contradiction with each other. In Trotsky's version the Twelfth Congress was the last Leninist, and the Thirteenth was the first Stalinist congress. In Shachtman's version, the Thirteenth was the last Leninist, and the Fourteenth was the first Stalinist.

Which one is telling the truth? Which was the last Leninist and which the first Stalinist congress of the R.C.P.?

Facts reveal that both Trotsky and Shachtman are falsifying the history of the R.C.P. History proves that the last Leninist Congress was the Eleventh and the first Stalinist Congress was

8
the Twelfth.

The Twelfth Congress was the one for which Lenin wrote his voluminous letter on the National Question (the "bomb" against Stalin) and at which he planned the removal of Stalin from his post, together with a complete exposure of the Stalin clique on all questions:

"Lenin was now preparing not only to remove Stalin from his post of general secretary, but to disqualify him before the party as well. On the question of monopoly of foreign trade, on the national question, on the question of the regime in the party, of the workers-peasants inspection, and of the commission of control, he was preparing to deliver AT THE TWELFTH CONGRESS a crushing blow at Stalin as personifying bureaucracy, the mutual shielding among officials, arbitrary rule and general rudeness." (L. Trotsky, My Life, pp. 480-1. My emphasis, S.E.B.)

Due to his illness, Lenin was unable to appear at the Congress. Lenin's "bomb" against Stalin was entrusted to Trotsky. On March 16, 1923, Lenin's secretary wrote Trotsky and Kamenev (then president of the Politburo), an official communication stating that Lenin authorized Trotsky to defend Lenin's position at the Twelfth Congress. (L. Trotsky, The Stalin School of Falsification, p. 70)

For the Twelfth Congress, therefore, there were two diametrically opposed, mutually exclusive lines: one, that of the Stalin gang aimed at bureaucratically usurping power; the other, the line proposed by Lenin and entrusted to Trotsky to carry out the political and organizational destruction of the Stalin faction. A close study of historical facts reveals that at the Twelfth Congress Trotsky, instead of exploding Lenin's "bomb" in Stalin's face, in actuality gave his unreserved support to Stalin and the Stalinist line. The Twelfth Congress was marked by the unanimous acceptance of all the policies of the Stalinist Central Committee.

"The XII Party Congress was the first conducted without Lenin. . . All the resolutions of the Party Congress were passed unanimously. When the Party Congress accepted the general resolution on the policy of the Central Committee without a single abstention or contrary voice, all the delegates arose and sang the 'International.' All felt the historic significance of that moment." (Die Internationale, June 1, 1923, p. 325)

Zinoviev, Stalin's ally in the Troika, proclaimed with regard to this Congress "All our resolutions have been adopted unanimously." (Pravda, April 26, 1923).

The Stalin gang was victorious because Trotsky did not carry forward the line entrusted to him by Lenin. That victory was possible, that victory was in Trotsky's hands during the period of preparations for the Twelfth Congress is admitted by Trotsky himself.

"And what is more, I have no doubt that if I had come forward on the eve of the twelfth congress in the spirit of a 'bloc of Lenin and Trotsky' against the Stalin bureaucracy, I should have been victorious even if Lenin had taken no direct part in the struggle." (L. Trotsky, My Life, p. 481)

"If I had come forward," says Trotsky, thereby clearly indicating that he did not do so. Trotsky's not coming forward with Lenin's line to carry it forward to the victory which was in his hands was precisely the piece of treachery that made the victory of Stalinism possible. With Lenin's line buried by Trotsky at the Twelfth Congress, the Stalinist line of usurpation of power in the workers' state became the dominating keynote of the new epoch that has set in, the epoch of the Stalinist conspiracy. Trotsky's betrayal of Lenin's line of the workers in favor of an effort to work in harmony with the Stalin clique became at the same time the

sence of post-Leninist, pro-Stalinist Trotskyism.

Like the competent criminals they are, the Trotskyite bureaucrats are careful to divert attention from the scene of their crimes. If the workers imagine that the Twelfth Congress was a Leninist affair it will not even enter their mind that this was precisely the occasion ~~on which the partnership of~~ Trotsky and the Stalin clique was officially established in the development of the Stalinist degeneration of the workers state. One of the milestones of the Trotskyite system of treachery will therefore remain concealed, and the role of Trotsky as an ally of the Stalinist clique will remain unexposed.

Naturally, if the workers give

serious thought to the question of the congresses — knowing the facts which we reveal — they can see from the Trotskyites' inconsistencies that all was not Leninist at the Twelfth and Thirteenth Congresses in which Trotsky actively participated. It is in order to cover up for Trotsky's anti-Leninist actions at the Twelfth Congress that Shachtman for good measure throws even the Thirteenth Congress into the Leninist category.

The game of concealing Trotsky's pro-Stalinist role often forces the Trotskyites to the point where they forget that they should consult each other in order, at least, to peddle a lie consistently.

S. E. Benson

SEND FOR A FREE COPY OF

DID TROTSKY COLLABORATE WITH STALIN

A REPLY TO J. R. JOHNSON OF THE WORKERS PARTY

by

GEORGE MARLEN

AN EXPOSURE, WITH DOCUMENTARY PROOF, OF THE REAL ROLE OF TROTSKY IN THE STALINIST USURPATION OF POWER IN THE FIRST WORKERS STATE.

A REFUTATION OF THE WORKERS PARTY'S DECEPTIONS ON TROTSKY'S PART IN THE STALINIST CONSPIRACY.

Address:
P.O. Box 87
Station D.
New York

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

TROTSKY "TEACHES" PARTY DISCIPLINE

DURING the hearings of the "Dewey Commission," Trotsky was questioned concerning his denial of Lenin's Testament. Trotsky alleged that DISCIPLINE TO THE PARTY motivated him to join the Stalin gang in lying about the authenticity of Lenin's Testament. The "Commissioner" Stolberg, referring to Trotsky's denial of the Testament asked Trotsky: "In other words, you did that from the point of view of Party discipline?" And Trotsky replied: "Yes." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 430.) It is necessary to investigate this story of Trotsky's that in denying the existence of Lenin's Testament he was impelled by his adherence to "Party discipline."

The crux of this entire matter is the question:- To whom was Trotsky being loyally disciplined when he denied the existence of Lenin's Testament? To Lenin and the workers, or to Stalin and his gang of bureaucratic connivers?

Lenin's Testament was intended as a blow against the disloyal General Secretary and the havoc his bureaucratic machinations were causing in the Workers' State. What was it that demanded of Trotsky that he deny Lenin's Testament? It was the interests of Stalin and his collaborators which demanded this service of Trotsky. Stalinism had to be protected against Lenin's Testament.

No honest worker-Bolshevik came to Trotsky and asked him to deny Lenin's Testament. The honest workers were being kept in ignorance of the Testament by Stalin and his henchmen.

It was to an honest worker that Trotsky was being disciplined. It was to Stalinism that Trotsky was so loyal. This kind of loyal discipline -- loyal discipline to a pack of renegades -- will be understood by every honest worker as nothing but renegacy.

The disloyal Stalin clique was by 1922 already in control of the Central Committee of the Party and of the country in general, as Trotsky himself relates:

"They became, Zinoviev and Kamenev -- with Stalin they created the so-called 'Troika,' or Triumvirate, which was the directing body of the Central Committee of the Party and of the country during the period from the end of 1922 to 1925." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 77.)

Let no one imagine that Trotsky first learned about the treachery of the Stalin gang while he was in exile in Mexico. He knew about Stalinist treachery and about Lenin's line against Stalinism while Lenin was still alive. Speaking of the period at the end of 1922, Trotsky writes:

"Lenin's intentions now were quite clear to me; by taking the example of Stalin's policy he wanted to expose to the party, and ruthlessly, the danger of the bureaucratic transformation of the dictatorship." (My Life, p. 484.)

The danger created by the Stalinization of the Party in 1922-23 and the line of Lenin against this Stalinism

ation was clear to Trotsky from the very beginning. Plainly, when Trotsky denied the existence of Lenin's Testament in the summer of 1925, he knew what he was doing, he understood the sinister, pro-Stalinist implications of his deceitful act:

Curiously enough, evidently forgetting his excuse of "discipline," Trotsky admitted before this same "Dewey Commission" that Lenin's line towards a genuine Bolshevik party, let alone a Stalinized party, was that one can break discipline when a question of fundamental importance is involved:

"...even in the Bolshevik Party, with its very severe discipline, Lenin first emphasized that the essence is more important than the form; that the ideas are more important than the discipline; that if it is a question of fundamental importance, he can break the rule of discipline without betraying the idea." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, pp. 422-423. Oct. 1957.)

If it is a Leninist act to break discipline with a genuine Bolshevik party when the interests of the workers require it, how can one claiming to be a Leninist offer as an excuse for any action whatever discipline to the Stalin gang of renegades!

Lenin called for a struggle against the faction of Stalin. Trotsky shielded the Stalin clique and today feeds the workers a deceptive story about "discipline."

Lenin's line against Stalinism can today be carried forward only by those who genuinely expose all whose political history compels them to offer excuses for their having shielded Stalin and having watched the rise of Stalinism.

SEND FOR A FREE COPY OF:-

STALIN, TROTSKY OR LENIN
by George Jackson

READ:-

STALIN, TROTSKY OR LENIN
by George Jackson

408 pages

Price \$1.00

READ:-

THE BULLETIN

8¢/copy

50¢/year

SEND TO:-

R. Rolene
P.O. Box 67
Station D.
New York

TROTSKY'S "ADVICE" TO THE RUSSIAN WORKERS

No revolutionary worker will deny the importance of studying Lenin's writings. The works of that revolutionary leader light up every vital corner of the political struggles of the classes in capitalist society. Lenin fought every form of opportunism existing or arising in his time. Without knowing these writings which bear upon his struggle against opportunism, the workers are considerably handicapped. Especially is this true with respect to their struggle against Stalinism. Unless the revolutionary workers have perhaps empirically arrived at the understanding that Stalinism represents a deadly plague, become familiar with Lenin's anti-Stalin writings, they will hardly grasp the problem of Stalinism. Many of these writings have been suppressed by Stalin and his collaborators. Some of the documents, however, due to the intricacies of the inter-bureaucratic convulsions of Stalinism, leaked out and became known to a few workers.

In October 1917 Lenin wrote letters dealing with the treacherous behavior of Zinoviev and Kamenev. These letters were addressed, one to the members of the Bolshevik Party, another to the Central Committee of the Party. The documents were well known to the Party leaders, including Trotsky. Infuriated against Zinoviev and Kamenev for their opposition to the seizure of power and their disclosure of the Bolshevik plans to the enemy, Lenin insisted on their expulsion. However he was overruled by the majority of the Central Committee (see *The Case of Leon Trotsky*, p. 76). During Lenin's

illness, Kamenev collected Lenin's works and published them (1922). By then Kamenev, Zinoviev and Stalin had organized their conspiracy for the seizure of power. In order to hide their political past they withheld Lenin's letters from publication. It appears that when Lenin had demanded the expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev, he had at that time felt keenly that there was something basically opportunistic in these two men. The sharpness of the moment passed, the Soviet Republic was established and survived the attack of the counter-revolution. Zinoviev and Kamenev appeared to have completely reformed and made good their opportunistic behavior in October 1917. But, as history reveals, the men showed themselves opportunist lackeys of bureaucratic power. They had opposed the seizure of power when it was to the order of the day, and after it had been firmly established they sought to destroy it. Had the letters not been published, the workers, who in the revolution had acted quite aggressively against the bureaucratic rule of the trio—Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin—would have probably derived a feeling that Zinoviev's and Kamenev's opportunism had not died out but broken out in a different form.

When the trio gathered strength and proceeded to bring under its sway all the republics that composed the Soviet Union, Lenin, though ill, perceived this opportunist policy and attacked it vigorously in a whole series of documents on the national question. These documents were handed to the Central Committee and to Trotsky, and

some of them to him alone. Most of these documents have remained suppressed to this day, and only very few have been published outside the Soviet Union and their content remains unknown to the Russian masses. Had the Russian workers known the contents of these important anti-Stalin documents at the time they were written, documents in which Lenin urged holding Stalin and his collaborators responsible for anti-Marxist policies, the workers might have received a correct ideological orientation in opposing Stalin.

Another vital anti-Stalin document was Lenin's Testament, in which he laid down outright the policy for the Communists to remove Stalin from power. The Testament, according to Trotsky, was read at his presence at a secret session of the Politburo members on May 22, 1924. All these anti-Stalin documents constituted a powerful ideological instrument for the struggle against Stalin.

Known of all these documents by Lenin's, Trotsky knew all the time that they were being suppressed. And while they were being suppressed, Trotsky not only did not reveal this criminal secret, but did something far worse. Almost six months after Lenin's death and a few weeks after the Testament was read, Trotsky, in one of his speeches said to the Russian workers about Lenin's writings:

"YOU HAVE NOT THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ EVERYTHING THAT LENIN WROTE. I advise you, — it is very beneficial, — to note especially in these books, those places in which he headed the mass, what it wants, what it needs, — not only what it wants, but what it did not learn yet to want...." (Leon Trotsky, Pravda, July 10, 1924. My capitals — U.S.)

Trotsky was of course fully con-

scious of the fact that the workers were not given the opportunity of reading everything that Lenin wrote. Trotsky was fully conscious of the fact that precisely those writings of Lenin which could have helped the workers to combat the deadly malady of Stalinism, Lenin's writings on the national question, Lenin's Testament and other important documents, were being deliberately withheld from the workers. The Russian workers could follow Trotsky's advice and read those of Lenin's writings published by the Trio, but they would have never suspected that Lenin's line was to remove Stalin, to arrest his henchman Ordjonikidze and generally to break up the whole Stalinist bureaucracy. Even when exposed abroad outside the Soviet Union, the revelation that Lenin left a Testament in which he laid down the line to remove Stalin, Trotsky concealed:

"... Lenin has not left any 'last will and testament' in regard to a controlled or organized 'will' is called 'last testament' in... It was not to be. It is assumed that the will was the character of the leading party comrades given to Lenin. It is only partly correct. How could it be? This party had been engaged for long years of bitter struggle, now could it stand at the head of masses of millions, carried through the greatest revolution of the world, to further the formation of revolutionary parties in other countries." There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman." (Leon Trotsky, Inprecorr, Sept. 3, 1925, pp. 1002, 1006.)

Trotsky collaborated with Stalin in hiding Lenin's anti-Stalin documents, and deceived the workers in Russia and in the Comintern.

G. M. A.
April 4, 1941

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

SHACHTMAN FAILS TO FINISH A STORY

UPON the death of Lenin in the beginning of 1924, the Stalin clique and its supporters lunged into a vast maneuver to pack the Bolshevik party with hundreds of thousands of hand-picked flunkys and back-and-forth elements. A huge "recruiting drive," demagogically called the "Lenin Levy," or "Lenin recruiting" was inaugurated by Stalin and Company for the purpose of creating a broad bureaucratic base in the Party on which to rest their usurped power.

In an article written to commemorate the first anniversary of Trotsky's death, Max Shachtman finds occasion to quote one of Trotsky's references to the reactionary levy in the "Lenin Levy":

"You know that in 1924 we sent the party in its various 'Lenin Levy' to a tremendous influx of hundreds of thousands of raw, untrained people, who constituted thereafter the big reserve force of the bureaucracy. The party was diluted and finally disintegrated by the Bonapartists by precisely this method." (*Isaac Asimov, Nov. 2, 1941, p. 3.*)

That the Stalinist conspirators corrupted and undermined the party by this maneuver is, of course, indubitable. The "Lenin Levy" or recruiting of 1924 consolidated the hold of the Stalinist bureaucrats by opening the hitherto carefully guarded gates of the party to people who were committed in advance to support Stalin. The full import of the reactionary, anti-

Leninist nature of this Stalinist move can be seen when one studies the stringent regulations insisted upon by Lenin as conditions for party membership and his reasons for the same in his proposals to the Eleventh Congress of the B.C.P. (See "Two Notes to V. I. Lenin," W. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. IX, pages 320-323.)

Trotsky, many years after the "Lenin Levy" quite correctly pointed out that it dealt a death blow to the Party of Lenin:

"By breaking the bureaucracy from the control of the proletarian vanguard the 'Lenin Levy' dealt a death blow to the party of Lenin." (*Max Shachtman, The Revolution Betrayed, 1937, p. 98.*)

Trotsky shattered the illusion that he fought against the Stalinist degeneration of the Bolshevik Party. The 100,000 in 1937 read his attack on the "Lenin Levy" they were given the impression that in the concrete situation in 1924 Trotsky fought against the "Lenin Levy." In the article of Shachtman mentioned above, Trotsky is referred to as one who fought against the Stalinist development. It is within this context that Shachtman repeats Trotsky's words stigmatizing the reactionary Stalinist nature of the so-called "Lenin recruiting" of 1924.

Let us look a bit deeper into the story of the "Lenin Levy" and conclude the incomplete tale told by Trotsky and the Shachtmans. At the 13th Com-

of the R.O.F. held in May 1934, "Lenin recruiting" was demagogic - characterized in the following way by Stalin:

"Such facts as the discussion and the Leninist recruiting - there is no need of proving this - are the greatest events in the country and in the party... our party, having taken in two hundred thousand members with the still and consent of the entire working class, is in fact an elective party, an elective organ of the working class." (Quoted, May 27, 1934.)

Stalin made this speech at the evening session of May 26, 1934. And now the Trotsky, the alleged fighter against the Stalinist corruption of the party, comes Stalin's "Lenin recruiting" about the "Lenin recruiting" Trotsky comes after Stalin at the day session of May 26. Here is Trotsky's statement on the "Lenin recruiting":

"Lenin recruiting, the Leninist recruiting, at the time of the revolution, was a necessary and correct thing to do, but now it is a corrupt thing to do." (Quoted, May 27, 1934.)

This was a direct attack on Lenin's recruiting. "The Lenin recruiting" is a corrupt thing to do, says Trotsky, because the "Lenin recruiting" was a corrupt thing to do at the time of the revolution, but now it is a corrupt thing to do." (Quoted, May 27, 1934.)

Trotsky is not content with only attacking the Leninist recruiting. In a speech to the workers at the time of the Leninist recruiting, he said: "The Leninist recruiting is a corrupt thing to do, but now it is a corrupt thing to do." (Quoted, May 27, 1934.)

democratic workers voice:

"When the workingclass reacts to the death of its leader in such manner that Baku gives 9,500 new party members - this is the highest voting; this is not parliamentary charlatanism, not parliamentary deception, but a genuine democratic workers voice." (Pravda, April 15, 1934.)

The fact that Trotsky supported this Stalinist maneuver is the crucial point that Trotsky and the Stuchmans conceal in their stories about the "Lenin recruiting". Then the story is complete and we see that Trotsky supports Stalin in his drive to liquidate the Bolshevik Party.

There are those who argue that Trotsky's distance in his alleged fight against the Stalinist "Lenin recruiting" is a corrupt thing to do. "The Lenin recruiting" is a corrupt thing to do, says Trotsky, because the "Lenin recruiting" was a corrupt thing to do at the time of the revolution, but now it is a corrupt thing to do." (Quoted, May 27, 1934.)

Trotsky, of course, in his usual hypocritical way, covers up and hides away alive this Trotskyist deception.

Arthur Luke
October 3, 1941

HOW TROTSKY "EXPOSED"
STALIN'S KRESTINTERN

ROM. the early years of the
bureaucratic degeneration of the
Comintern, Stalin and his aides have
been manufacturing auxiliary traps for
the world toiling masses. One of
these traps was the Peasant Inter-
national (Krestintern). It provided
jobs for a host of Stalin's bureaucratic
flunkys. It spread illusions among
the workers that the most nationalistic
class in capitalist society, the
peasantry, could be internationalized.
On the whole the Stalinists distorted
and exaggerated the political role of
the peasantry, giving the impression
that it could play an independent part
and possess a revolutionary party of
its own instead of following the prole-
tariat - or the internationalists, as the
case might be.

In January's Bulletin of the Open
 following: "The following are the
 the following: the following: the following:

"What is happening with the
Kremlins? It has looked to me
colossal especially for some time
past. We cannot get it out
people who are not, certainly, to
resistance. From the very start
we considered that the people were
surprised to find, not in the end
— resistance." (Quoted in the
Opposition, Internationalist, 1930,
#18-19, p. 2) (Washington, Dec. 20,
1930, p. 2)

According to the above mentioned Trotsky and his close associates' conduct, the Soviet Union present international position is stationary. That is, it is stationary in time. In regard to the future, that Trotsky and his group know, the very onset of the Second World War, the Stalin's reaction, in opposition to the Krestinterr.

ated by the Trotskyists is true to

Stalin and his clique made use of their "Krestintern" chiefly in the year of 1924. At the Fifth Congress of the C. I. held in the Summer of that year, the Stalinists issued a Manifesto filled with the most attractive illusions. Hardly any Stalinist deception was omitted in.

that Manifesto. Here is what it said about the Stalinist concoction called the Krestintern:

"And you, plundered and oppressed peasants, adhere to our great union. The Krestintern, created last year, fully and completely contributes its energies to the struggle against militarism and danger of new war.

"Peasants of Europe! Farmers of America! Tillers of the entire world! The fate of your economy and the lives of your sons are involved." (Manifesto of the 5th Congress of the C.I. Pravda, July 2, 1924. On the occasion of the 10th Anniversary of the Imperialist War.)

As we know, the Stalinist
bureaucrats like that their bureau-
cratic organization, which had
been on paper, was fight-
ing imperialism. The Stalinist bureau-
crats actually destroy the deep-
rooted attachment of the peasants of
the whole world to their economy,
that is, to their property, by
destroying their eyes the false
idea called the Krestinism.

What has that
manifesto contained
in Fifth World
War, the Fifth World
War of 1944, to do with
the first place
at the Congress,
as its presidium,
and as much as the single
line of Stalinism as
expressed in the Manifesto. And
Trotzky himself
concerning
of that counter-
revolutionary Stalinist Manifesto:

"At the Fifth World Congress (1924) I W R O T E the manifesto on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the imperialist war." (Leon Trotsky, The Stalin School of Falsification, p. 162. My emphasis - G.M.)

We believe that comment is superfluous, for Trotsky's collaboration with Stalin in spreading deceptions is quite obvious.

G.M., June 14, 1941

THE CREATION OF A NEW
REVOLUTIONARY PARTY TO
REPLACE THE COMINTERN WHICH UNDERWENT COMPLETE DEGENERA-
TION AT THE HANDS OF USURPERS AND RENEGADES IS STILL THE
CHIEF IMMEDIATE TASK FACING THE CLASS-CONSCIOUS WORKERS.
Without such a Party, a successful struggle against the
bourgeoisie is utterly out of the question. An under-
standing of the various opportunist forces which pose as
builders of a new revolutionary Party is an essential pre-
requisite for the task. A struggle against these "Fourth
Internationalist" opportunists must be waged to clear the
ground for the growth of a genuine revolutionary Fourth
International. THE BULLETIN is the only ex-
isting theoretical organ of such a struggle.

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS!

READ

THE BULLETIN

Address:
P.O. Box 67
Station D.
New York

HISTORY WRITTEN TO ORDER

RUSSIAN, The Militant ran a series of articles by Lydia Seidel entitled: "The Crimes of Stalin." Under the heading, "How Stalin Strangled the German Proletarian Revolution - 1933," Seidel recounts a number of the crimes committed by Stalin and certain of his allies in that situation. "Stalin... the betrayer of the workers and the Socialist policy of a workers' government" in Germany. (which article)

"Stalin... the betrayer of the workers and the Socialist policy of a workers' government" in Germany. (which article)

From reading the above account it would readily be a matter of fact that policy of the workers' government was limited to Stalin and his Comintern allies (Trotsky, etc.), and that therefore this crime was not due to Stalin and his lieutenants. In actuality, the "workers' government" included others than Stalin-Brandler.

In 1933, the "workers' government" policy was put into effect by the Stalinist army in Germany at the directives of the Comintern leadership. In Saxony and Thuringia during the month of October "workers' governments" were formed. They were composed of Social-democrats in the majority and Stalinist agents in the minority, with the bourgeois-democratic parliamentary German state machine-

ry as the basis. All bourgeois state machines, - "democratic," fascist, military or whatnot, - irrespective of their composition, - Liberal, Social-democratic, "Labor" or anything else, - act and react only in the interests of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois-democratic "workers' governments" of Saxony and Thuringia fell under this law with this iron and unalterable rule. These so-called "workers' governments" paralyzed the workers, wasted the will of the impatient and opened the path for the Hitler system of the workers.

What was Trotsky to do in the midst of all this? What was he doing? Seidel is referring to the 1933 period of the German revolution.

"Trotsky was then isolated by the forces of the anti-Trotsky alliance of Stalin, Klement and Kamenoff." (The Militant, Nov. 1, 1941, p. 5.)

Is this statement true, or is it a cover-up for what actually happened?

Obviously enough, the "isolated" Trotsky was very much in evidence and his voice was heard, far and wide by hundreds of thousands of workers who looked up to him as to a tremendous power, believing him to be a living fountain of Leninist, unshakably loyal to the toiling masses. "That was it that the workers heard Trotsky saying? Did Trotsky expose the fraudulent "workers' government" of Saxony and Thuringia? Did Trotsky explain to the German and other workers that these coalitions of Stalinist and Social-

democratic bureaucrats in the bourgeois state in no way whatsoever represented the policy of Lenin, that these opportunist coalitions were a treacherous departure from the policy pursued by the Bolsheviks in the Russian Revolution?

In a speech before the Metal Workers Congress in Moscow during the fateful events of October 1923, Trotsky dealt with the coalition governments in Saxony and Thuringia. Here is what he had to say about them:

"At the present time the situation is clear. The coalition of the Communists with the Social Democrats in the governments of Saxony and Thuringia is comparable to the coalition of the Communists and Left Social Democrats in Russia." (Leningrad, Nov. 27, 1923.)

Note this statement carefully. Here Trotsky was equating the opportunist coalition formed on the basis of the German bourgeois state with the Bolshevik-influenced coalition formed after the overthrow of the Russian capitalists on the basis of a PROLETARIAN state. This description was given as to hoodwinking the German workers and other workers into imagining that some kind of a proletarian dictatorship had been established in Germany was precisely the dose of poison fed the workers by Stalin and his henchmen. Far and wide the Stalin gang was shouting that the "workers' governments" of Germany were revolutionary organs leading the toilers to power. And Trotsky? In the same speech he cried:-

"If all the signs of the struggle

do not deceive us we may expect that in the near future power will go over into the hands of the working class." (Ibid.)

The remarks of the "isolated" Trotsky comparing the Left bourgeois-democratic governments of Saxony and Thuringia to the Bolshevik Soviet government headed by Lenin were printed in scores of thousands of copies in the Soviet press. They were translated and spread about the Comintern; they can be found in an American Comintern paper, The Worker of December 1, 1923. It was true that the "isolated" Trotsky "found" the betrayal of the German revolution of 1923.

Significantly, Meidel does not quote this speech of Trotsky's; for that matter, no Trotskyite leader ever quotes it. Their game is to give the impression by various direct and indirect means that Trotsky battled as best he could against the Stalinist reactionary trait "workers' government" to which the German Revolution of 1923 was betrayed. In such a game, historical evidence is something, to be concealed, the past is a commodity to be adulterated, counterfeited and sold to the uninformed and unsuspecting. By such devices, Trotsky's actual role, that of collaborator of the Stalin clique, is falsified and palmed off as a continuation of the Leninist heritage.

J. C. Hunter
February 28, 1942

MORE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE on Trotsky's opportunist role in the German revolution of 1923 will be found in:-

SHACHTMAN AS AN HISTORIAN
CANNON'S "CLEAN" BANNER

Send for FREE copies of these articles in THE BULLETIN.

Address
P.O.Box 67
Sta. D.
N.Y.

SCHACHTMAN AS AN "HISTORIAN"

By R. Regora

MAX SCHACHTMAN writes in the New International of January 1938:

"In 1923, when the German revolution was expected, the Soviet Republic stood at attention to aid it. The harbor of Petrograd was filled with grain ships ready to sail for Stettin so that the German Soviet Republic would not be starved out by the Entente. Representatives of the Comintern and the Russian Party were active on German soil, preparing for the uprising as soon as it could under the leadership of Brandler and Zinoviev." (Page 11, My Opponents - ...)

How much truth is there in this story? In 1923 the representatives of the Comintern and Russian Communist Party were busy their best to leading the impending German revolution to a successful conclusion. Within fifteen years after the event, Schachtman gives a favorable picture of the party's leadership and Comintern's assistance. Communist Party gave the German workers. All investigation of earlier writings of Schachtman and the Trotskyites reveals that the situation was not quite as inspiring — to the workers — as Schachtman in 1938 would have his readers believe. But let see what Schachtman really knows about the German revolution of 1923.

First, Schachtman, who without doubt read THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY, which was published in 1937, before Schachtman made the statement in the New International, knows that Zinoviev, Kamenev with Stalin created the Triumvirate, which in 1922 became the directing body of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and of the entire country:

"They became, Zinoviev, Kamenev — with Stalin they created the so-called "Troika," or Triumvirate, which was the directing body of the Central Committee of the Party and of the country during the period from the end of 1922 to 1925." (L. Trotsky, "The Case of Leon Trotsky," p. 77.)

Stalin, a bureaucratic conniver, represented to Lenin the bureaucratic undermining of the proletarian dictatorship, and Lenin planned to annihilate Stalin to preserve the proletarian dictatorship. Schachtman as editor of Trotsky's works is surely familiar with the fact.

Schachtman also knows that Stalin was transferring his treacherous methods to the Communist International, Schachtman is well acquainted with Stalin's letter to his comrade Zinoviev, Bukharin, for he himself quotes it in his work "Ten Years of the Left Opposition."

Should the Communists (at the given stage) strive to seize power without the social democrats, are they mature enough for that? that in my opinion is the question. When we seized power, we had in Russia such reserves as (a) peace, (b) the land to the peasants, (c) the support of the great majority of the working class, (d) the sympathy of the peasantry. The German Communists at this moment have nothing of the sort. Of course, they have the Soviet nation as their neighbor which we did not have, but what can we offer them at the present moment? (my emphasis - R.R.) Of course the fascists are not asleep but it is to our interest that they attack

tion
Trot; that will rally the entire working class around the Communists
.....In my opinion the Germans must be curbed and not spurred on." (Emphasis in the Original. Quoted by Max Schachtman in "Ten Years of the Left Opposition," p. 20, and by Leon Trotsky, "The Third International After Lenin," p. 323.)

It must be pointed out here that Schachtman wrote his Ten Years in 1933, long before he wrote the article in the New International in January 1938.

Trotsky knew far back in 1923, in advance, that the leadership of the German Communist Party was a pack of parricidal flunkys and that the German revolution was doomed to failure. And Schachtman certainly knew it when he wrote "Ten Years of the Left Opposition," for he quotes Trotsky in that work:

"Comrade Trotsky, before leaving the session of the Central Committee (September 1923) made a speech which profoundly distressed all the members of the Central Committee and in which he alleged that the leadership of the German Communist Party was worthless and that the Central Committee of the German Communist Party was permeated with fatalism, sleep-headiness, etc. Comrade Trotsky also declared that the German revolution was doomed to failure." (Max Schachtman, "Ten Years of the Left Opposition," p. 20. Also quoted by Trotsky in "The Third International After Lenin," p. 94. My emphasis - R.H.)

As to the "leadership of the Comintern," let Schachtman speak:

"The policy pursued by the party leaders in Germany was not peculiar to Brandler and Thalheimer. It was derived from the leadership of the Communist International and the Russian Communist Party..... (M. Schachtman, "Ten Years of the L.O." p. 19.)

In so far as Schachtman's statement that "The harbor of Petrograd was filled with grain snips ready to sail

21
for Stettin so that the German Soviet Republic would not be starved out by the Entente" is concerned, the fact is that grain was sold by the Stalinist government to the German bourgeois government which was bankrupt politically and economically. This grain was part of the regular grain shipment from Russia to Germany which took place to a vast extent in 1923:

"Germany, as is known, is the largest purchaser of our rye. The commercial representatives of the U.S.S.R. in Berlin sold in 1923 over seventy million poods of grain, a considerable part of it having been bought at the instruction of the German Government." (Report of Telegram of U.S.S.R. in Germany, Stomoniakov, Pravda, Jan. 3, 1924.)

Whether or not Schachtman is aware of this specific point we do not know, though as an "historian" he pretends to enlighten the workers. But there is no doubt that Trotsky, a student of the economic institutions of the Soviet Republic in 1923, is entirely aware of it. Nevertheless, Trotsky acquiescing in the Schachtmanite whitewashing of the Stalinist treachery of 1923, lets the distortions of his American flunkoy stand to delude the mind of the workers.

To sum up: from the documentary evidence produced by Schachtman and Trotsky themselves we see that Schachtman in 1938 knew the following facts: that Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin were at the head of the bureaucratized party, the Soviet Union and the Comintern; that Lenin prepared for a struggle to remove and annihilate Stalin and his tendency and save the proletariat from the frightful degeneration of the first Workers State, and to advance the international revolution; that the Trio, Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev were transferring their treacherous methods from the Soviet Union to the international arena, in this instance to Germany, to prevent the extension of the revolution and to preserve for themselves the bureaucratic hegemony in the Soviet Union; that the German leadership was worthless, was dragging the revolution to destruction; and

The Political Nature of the
Trotsky-Zinoviev Bloc

In the Leninist days during the struggle of various currents of thought within the Russian working class, there were formed theoretical prognoses of the nature and course of the Russian Revolution. The Menshevik conception was that the Russian revolution, which had to fulfill the bourgeois-democratic tasks, would be led by the bourgeoisie supported by the proletariat. In plain words, the Menshevik position represented the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Lenin's position was that there would take place neither the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie nor the dictatorship of the proletariat, but a third, sort of transitional power, which he designated as "the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." This position proved to be correct, and sometime after the October Revolution, Lenin's correct evaluation was formulated as follows:

"In a capitalist society, when it is revolting, when it stands solid or is partitioning, all alike, there can be only one out of two kinds of power: Either the power of the capitalists or that of the proletariat. Every latter-day power is a dream." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVI, p. 297. Russian Edition. My emphasis - G.M.)

In 1908, as opposed to the Mensheviks and to Lenin, Trotsky presented his position, which declared that the Russian revolution could succeed only as the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the peasantry. Trotsky's prognosis allowed the possibility of the proletarian revolution taking place in Russia prior to the seizure of power by the proletariat in Europe. Trotsky summed up his prognosis under the formula "The Theory of

the Permanent Revolution." As history has incontrovertibly established, the Russian Revolution followed the course marked by Trotsky.

With the formation of the conspiratory Trio, (Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev), revolutionary theories and the history of the October Revolution became distorted. The Trio invented a "political" target labeled "Trotskyism" for the purpose of tearing down Trotsky and consolidating themselves in power. Zinoviev was the spearhead in this game, and the chief falsifier of history. At the end of 1925, Stalin, having considerably consolidated his personal dictatorship, pushed Zinoviev and Kamenev out of power and compelled them to go over to a silent opposition. In 1926, Zinoviev and Kamenev were in touch with the Trotsky 1923 "Opposition" group in the problem of organizing the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc. Zinoviev, who previously had been teaching his followers that Lenin had been right as against Trotsky on the prognosis of the Russian Revolution, faced a dilemma:

"Zinoviev's position at that time was truly tragic. Only yesterday a recognized leader of anti-Trotskyism, he on the next day bowed to the banner of the 1923 Opposition. At the sessions of the C.C., all the speakers took every occasion to fling in his face his own declarations of yesterday to which he could say nothing in reply. The same thing was done day in and day out by Pravda. On the other hand, the advanced Petrograd workers, followers of Zinoviev, who had engaged honestly and seriously in the struggle against 'Trotskyism' could by no means reconcile them-

selves to the sudden turn of 180 degrees. Zinoviev was confronted with the danger of losing the best elements of his own faction." (Leon Trotsky, "Archives of the Revolution," The New International, February 1933, p. 57.)

Zinoviev required a face-saver. This face-saver could be no less than Trotsky's rejection and repudiation, openly, officially, in public, of the Theory of the Permanent Revolution.

"With my acknowledgment of Lenin's correctness, Zinoviev sought, if only partially, to throw a veil over the previous criminal 'ideological' work of his own faction against me." (Ibid.)

At the Seventh Plenum of the ECCP Trotsky made the declaration necessary for Zinoviev, stating it is written to be presented to the entire Communist International. This declaration, signed by Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, was later made part of the political Platform of the Revolution. Here it is:

"It is not true that we are defending 'Trotskyism'. Trotsky has stated to the International that in all these questions of principle upon which he disagreed with Lenin, Lenin was right — and particularly upon the question of the permanent revolution and the revolution." (Emphasis - G.M.)

After Trotsky had been exiled abroad, he was asked by Albert Treint, an expelled leader of the French Communist Party, to explain this business of agreeing to supply Zinoviev with a cover for Zinoviev's previous lies and deceptions. Treint evidently was aware of the proven correctness of Trotsky's Permanent Revolution. In the reply to Treint, Trotsky presented

two points to justify his act. First, that this was really not a principled question, and secondly, that in the Trotsky group of 1923, where Radek and others weighed the question of repudiating the correctness of Trotsky's permanent revolution, Trotsky voted against the proposition.

About eight and a half years after he wrote his letter to Treint, Trotsky inadvertently made two admissions. One admission was that the question was really an important principled question. The second admission throws a revealing light on Trotsky's assertion that he voted against the proposition, for that assertion conveyed the impression that he had been outvoted by a majority in his group. Here are these two points:

"In certain important questions, it is true, the 1923 opposition made essential concessions to the opposition in 1925 — against my vote — concessions which I considered and still consider in omission. The circumstance that I did not vote against these concessions was, rather, a mistake. At that time, essentially, not much was known of the 1923 — we were separated by exile. In any event, those times were very well acquainted with the views of the controversy. Within the 1923 opposition, only a hundred or a thousand out of a thousand if not more stood on a point of view and the rest on the point of view of the majority." (Leon Trotsky, The New International, March 1940, p. 31. Emphasis - G.M.)

Trotsky says that he "voted" against accepting the proposition of Zinoviev. Very possible. But then, one can readily perceive what sort of people were at the head of the Left Opposition if they could pass a decision that their leader prostitute himself and distort the great historical truth of the Permanent Revolution. More, if we accept Trotsky's statement that 999 out of 1,000 in his group

* For the inclusion of this statement in the Platform of the Opposition, see Leon Trotsky, "The Real Situation in Russia," p. 180.

with him against Zinoviev's proposal, one can recognize the stripe of these leaders of the Left Opposition. Obviously, they were cynical bureaucrats who completely ignored the thoughts, the wishes, and the feelings of the overwhelming majority of their rank-and-file followers.

Trotsky may have "voted" against the leading circle which he says indicated on his accepting Zinoviev's proposition. The fact remains that he carried out the unprincipled line of Zinoviev and of his own colleagues of the 1935 Left Opposition, and at the 1st Plenum of the 1935 made a public declaration out of Zinoviev's proposed proposal, but of the parallel position of permanent revolution. And he did that, he knew well, not in the interests of the proletarian, but in order to provide a platform for Zinoviev who provided and cynically attacked this very proposal. Trotsky's later, Trotsky's own very outright and shameful abandonment of the Platform of the Opposition.

Moreover, the 1935 Left Opposition's platform is a piece of propaganda in the hands of the enemy. Trotsky's own friends, comrades and his own people which he betrayed and which he had accepted. Trotsky's "platform" is a piece of propaganda in the hands of the enemy, to be used by the enemy, to use it will. After all, the proposition of Zinoviev was that Trotsky appear before the plenum on a crooked program, and that Trotsky did. When Zinoviev came around with his proposition, he came as a crook and should have been picked out and exposed. To an honest person, there could have been no question of entering into formal relations with such a renegade or of playing at democracy with him by voting and adhering to parliamentary procedure. The workers were not concerned with Trotsky's vote; they were concerned with his program, and that program represented a factional horse-deal between Trotsky's Left Opposition and Zinoviev.

It is clear from the above that Trotsky participated in unprincipled

concessions. The latter Trotsky himself admits. It is interesting, therefore, to observe how politically dishonest is such a person as Max Shachtman who, concealing the true political history of Trotsky, is brazen enough to make the following fraudulent statement:-

"Trotsky's record of struggle is a single unbroken line from which he never departed. It would have been fairly easy for him to retain his enormous power in the Soviet Union at the expense of principle, but that was a cost he could never pay for anything." (M. Shachtman, New International, September 1940, p. 133.)

No one can pretend that Shachtman was unaware of Trotsky's participation in carrying out the unprincipled line of the Left Opposition. Trotsky's admission that the line of the Left Opposition was unprincipled is contained in a article published in a magazine of which Shachtman was — and still is — an editor. Nor can there be any doubt that Shachtman is aware that the Platform of the Opposition published under Trotsky's name (as The Real Situation in Russia) contained a renunciation of the permanent revolution (page 130). Shachtman's pretense that Trotsky was a consistently principled Marxist is clearly a cover-up of an opportunist by an opportunist.

In view of the fact that Trotsky officially distorted the historical facts and surrendered to Zinoviev in a factional deal the basic principle of permanent revolution, and the Zinoviev "Opposition" accepted such unprincipled surrender, it is obvious that the so-called "opposition bloc" did not stand upon Marxian grounds. Therefore, the statement by the Cannon gang that "The Bolshevik-Leninists, the Left Opposition, fought the degeneration at every step" (Statement by the Political Committee of the S.W.P., New International, Feb. 1940), is an unadulterated lie. The "Left Opposition" led by Trotsky was part of the degeneration of the first proletarian revolution, and the Cannon and Shachtman cliques are organically tied

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL
to that reactionary process.

* * *

TRICKY PHRASES CANNOT
HIDE THE TRUTH

Trotsky surrendered the historical correctness of the Permanent Revolution in the Fall of 1926 at the height of the Chinese revolution of 1925-27. Instead of this basic principle of proletarian dictatorship which Lenin together with Trotsky applied in 1917, Trotsky, during the great upheaval in China, advanced the formula of "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry," the old, incorrect, discarded formula of Lenin, with which Stalin and Kamenev in 1917 almost killed the Russian Revolution. It was only in the Summer of 1928, after the betrayal of the Chinese revolution and the collapse of the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Trotsky bloc, that Trotsky withdrew, as if retreating out of an ordinary war, and introduced the Permanent Revolution once again as his fundamental "position."

In doing so, Trotsky tried to pass the buck for his own principled substitution of the old formula of "democratic dictatorship" for the latter edition of the Permanent Revolution. He charged that its application to the Chinese Revolution was handled in the Platform of the Opposition by Zinoviev:

"In the Platform, the question of the Chinese revolution is dealt with very insufficiently, incompletely, and in part positively falsely by Zinoviev." (L. Trotsky, "Third International After Lenin," p. 132.)

As though Trotsky himself did not share responsibility for the Platform of the Opposition!

Trotsky's lieutenants, Cannon and Shachtman, fully aware of Trotsky's juggling with the Permanent Revolution,

tried their best to conceal the fact that Trotsky, as well as Stalin, betrayed the Chinese revolution. Shachtman employed very subtle terms in doing this crooked job. Here are Shachtman's phrases:

"In the later articles, comrade Trotsky counterposes the permanent revolution to the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, whereas the earlier articles do not make such a contrast; indeed, the 1927 Platform of the Opposition speaks for the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. The conflict is more apparent than real and is derived from two sources. The first is that in the bloc established in 1925 between the 'Trotsky' and the 'Zinoviev' Oppositions (The Moscow Opposition of 1925 and the Leningrad Opposition of 1925), formal concessions of this kind were made by the former to the Left Committee of Leningrad in the interests of maintaining the bloc against the democratic policy of Stalin and Kamenev. The second is that in 1926-27, the slogan of the 'democratic dictatorship,' borrowed literally and formally from Lenin's 1917 writings, had not yet been fully filled with the revolutionary content which the slogan had been intended into it." (Shachtman, Introduction to Trotsky's "Questions of the Chinese Revolution," p. 12.)

As we see, Shachtman seeks to convey the impression that Trotsky inserted the formula "democratic dictatorship" into the Platform in order to fight Stalin's policy. But we know from Trotsky's own words that the whole affair involved the problem of supplying Zinoviev with a face-saver to appease his followers. As far as Shachtman's fairy tale that this was done to fight Stalin's policy is concerned, the truth is that the slogan of "democratic dictatorship" was made use of in 1924 by the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev clique to fight Trotsky and was therefore part of Stalin's own "theoretical" fakery. Such was Trotsky's "fight" against Stalin!

It must be pointed out that when Lenin coined his formula, "democratic dictatorship," in the pre-1905 period, it was actually a theoretical error, whereas when Trotsky inserted this formula into the Platform of the Opposition and tried to foist it upon the proletariat, he did this not because of an honest error, but as a result of a factional deal with Stalin's former partner, Zinoviev.

Cannon, like Shachtman, uses deceptive words to cover up Trotsky. He tries to make his followers imagine that Trotsky had a correct line on China in 1921-27. Did Trotsky and his followers propose the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the peasantry? No, Cannon admits that they spoke about the "democratic dictatorship":

"They wanted complete independence for the Communist Party and in general a course toward the establishment of a 'democratic dictatorship' through the workers and peasants' Soviets." (The Communist Party, U.S.A., 1934, p. 100, footnote 100. The Trotskyist Party, Comintern, in 'The United International After Lenin,' p. 104. My emphasis - G.M.)

The asterisk after the phrase, "Democratic Dictatorship," is not ours, but Cannon's. It refers to a little, innocent-looking footnote which reads as follows:

"The incorrect formula of the 'democratic dictatorship' was put

in the platform of the Opposition Bloc through the pressure of the Zinovievists in the bloc." (My emphasis - G.M.)

While Cannon tries to create the impression that Trotsky and the "Oppositionists" fought in the interests of the Chinese revolution, he is constrained to mention that their position was incorrect, and, concealing the truth about Trotsky's unprincipled horse-deal with Zinoviev, Cannon buries the whole matter in a footnote.

When one realizes that the difference between the correct principle of Permanent Revolution and the wrong formula of "democratic dictatorship" is the same as the difference between a life-saver and a noose, one can measure the distance that separates Cannon and Shachtman from honesty. Deceitful words cannot forever hide the truth about Trotsky's two-faced manipulations and the political treachery of his disciples, the Cannon and Shachtmans.

G. M.
May 1941.

* * *

NOTE: For additional material on Trotsky's repudiation of his theory of the Permanent Revolution, see "DID TROTSKY COLLABORATE WITH STALIN?" and "THE CANNONITES 'ANSWER' THE SHACHTMANITES." These can be obtained free. Send for them to P. O. Box 67, Station B, New York City.

Address:
P.O.B. 67
Sta. B.
New York

BACK ISSUES OF
THE BULLETIN
CAN BE OBTAINED
FREE

TROTSKY AND RADEK'S LINE ON CHINA

ONE of the better known political figures that passed across the screen of the history of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern was Karl Radek. For a few years, under Lenin's leadership, Radek generally held to Marxist positions. But with the bureaucratic degeneration of the Bolshevik Party, Radek departed from Marxism and sank into the false Socialist camp. When Trotsky and his allies in Russia, he gave the following indisputable facts regarding Radek's activities:

"Up till 1928 Radek held that it would be impossible to carry through any economic policy other than that of Stalin's bureaucracy. Up till 1928 Radek was completely convinced that it would be impossible to work together with the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie was essential to the Chinese revolution. During the strike in England, Radek was against the introduction of the London Regular Committee. After the strike and the fall of the Labour Government, Radek was against the revolution, Radek was against the slogan of the proletarian dictatorship and for that of a 'democratic' dictatorship. Interpreting that the same way Stalin, Bukharin and Martynov did." (L. D. Trotsky, The Militant, August 1, 1929.)

"Radek defended a mistaken line in the question of China...." (From Trotsky, "Letter to Souvarin," Bulletin of the Opposition, July 1929.)

We see in the above crystal-clear statements by Trotsky that on the most

vital questions confronting the workers Radek presented pro-Stalinist positions. Radek's line on China was not Marxist but definitely opportunist. Naturally long before Trotsky made the above statements in 1929, he knew of Radek's pro-Stalinist line of keeping the Chinese Communist workers in the ignorance and of Radek's rejection of the Marxist line of proletarian dictatorship for China. Trotsky was too closely associated with Radek in the past to not to have known of Radek's opportunist line on China. But Radek's Trotskyism was written during the Trotskyist period of 1925-1927 as a means of saving his job, you will not find it. It was not the true Trotskyism. Radek's line on China. Not only did the Trotskyists reveal the fact that Radek's line was crassly opportunist.

Radek, however, during the Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927 was one of the leaders of the "Opposition." He had a long record as the Trotskyist and was an opponent of the Stalin-Bukharin policy of subordinating the Chinese Communist workers to the Kiangsiens. He, therefore, trimmed his line which Trotsky showed afterward to have been essentially the same as that of Stalin-Bukharin, with opposition-in-tone, but perfectly loyal, inoffensive questions, suggestions and advice. But Stalin, in his drive for absolute personal dictatorship would tolerate no "oppositional" tone no matter how soft and how distant from a real attack upon him. Radek's "oppositional" trimmings were suppressed.

Trotsky, of course, knew that both the official line of Stalin-Bukharin and the sham "oppositional" line of Radek were a betrayal of the Chinese revolution. Yet, at that time he created the impression that of these two reactionary lines, which were essentially the same, Stalin had a false line and Radek a correct one:

"Radek cannot say anything openly in the press about his line, for otherwise the party would learn that Radek's line is being CONFIRMED by the whole course of events." (Leon Trotsky, Problems of the Chinese Revolution, p. 81. *My emphasis.* - G.M.)

Trotsky said this on May 17, 1927 after the betrayal of the Right Kuomintang and while the betrayal by the

Left Kuomintang was in the making. Need we add anything to show the true political character of Trotsky's defense of Radek's line which he knew all along was not Marxist, but reactionary and actually pro-Stalinist?

Thus, when Radek was a close adherent of Trotsky's group Trotsky presented Radek's line on China as "being confirmed by the whole course of events." But when Radek broke with Trotsky in a rabid fashion, Trotsky revealed suddenly that "Radek defended a mistaken line in the questions of China." Trotsky's utter opportunism and his sheerly factional approach to questions vital to the proletariat are obvious.

-G.M.
October 21, 1941

SEND FOR A FREE COPY OF

THE CANNONITES

"ANSWER"

THE SHACHTMANITES

BY
GEORGE MARLEN

* * *

The Motives of Zinoviev and Kamenev

ACCORDING to Trotsky, it was Zinoviev and Kamenev who, together with Stalin, were the founders of the Stalinist conspiracy to "usurp bureaucratic power in the first Workers' State. Corrupted by the great power they had held for a number of years, Zinoviev and Kamenev, and their partner, Stalin, formed a plot to entrench themselves bureaucratically in their positions. As far back as the period of the Tenth Russian Communist Party Congress of March 1921, Zinoviev, already maneuvering with an eye to the future, proposed and supported Stalin for a post to be created for him, that of General Secretary of the Party.

"At this same congress, on Zinoviev's initiative and with against Lenin's will, Stalin was put forward as a candidate for the post of the general secretary of the party." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th ed. p. 427.)

Stalin, however, later moved to this key position, gradually taking office and day by day, through other offices and appointments, a large host of bureaucrats and functionaries. This group of privileged parasites and parasites was welded into a bureaucratic machine which was to serve Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin as their political base in their aspirations to entrench themselves permanently in power. Stalinism, i.e., the bureaucratic usurpation of power in the Workers' State against the interests of the masses, was thus established.

This self-entrenchment, however, was only part of the scheme of Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin. They also aimed at centralizing power in their own clutches by wiping out the other outstanding political figures of the Soviet Republic. It was apparent that Lenin, ill and dying, would soon pass out of the political picture. The

Stalinist plotters, therefore, entered into a compact to destroy Trotsky who, after Lenin, was the leading political character of those times. "Zinoviev and Kamenev were the initiators of the struggle against me in 1923," writes Trotsky (*The Stalin School of Falsification*, p. xxxii.) In fact, even as far back as the time of the Tenth Party Congress in March 1921, these conspirators already had outlined in their mind their struggle against Trotsky. At this Congress, Trotsky reveals, "Zinoviev and others, not without a hidden thought of the struggle against me, supported the candidacy of Stalin for general secretary." (*The Unrevealed Testament of Lenin*, p. 72. *Emphasis.*) The mortal illness of Lenin in 1923 freed the plotters to crystallize and bring to a head their schemes.

The whole plan of the conspirators, writes Trotsky, "was that after they had mastered enough support in the organization, they would be official legitimate successors to Lenin." (*Ibid.*, p. 428.) The conspirators, by "Lenin's fall" connivance, actually created the necessary base of coverings to back them in their plot to usurp the leadership. Thirsting for personal power and self-glorification, profoundly envious of Trotsky's great prestige, the two generals, Zinoviev and Kamenev, were busy inciting all those who would lend a willing ear to slanders against Trotsky.

"Kamenev was asking the 'old Bolsheviks,' the majority of whom had at some time left the party for ten or fifteen years: 'Are we to allow Trotsky to become the one person empowered to direct the party and the state?' They began more frequently to rake up my past and my old disagreements with Lenin; it became Zinoviev's specialty." (*Ibid.*, pp. 429-430.)

carry out the criminal scheme conceived already at the beginning of 1921 and destroy Trotsky as a political leader, the clique of Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin began to spread monstrous lies about Trotsky's "underestimating the peasantry," his "Menshevism," and his being "opposed to socialism." In this fabrication of a frame-up "polemic" against "Trotskyism," Zinoviev and Kamenev after Trotsky the leading lights in the Soviet Republic, were in the forefront.

In later years, when Stalin, by then the real power in this conspiracy because of his key post of general secretary, had doublecrossed and broken down his partners, Zinoviev and Kamenev, these two scoundrels confessed freely to Trotsky that the whole racket about "Trotskyism" was a pure invention concocted in the struggle for power that had broken out amongst the rank-and-file Bolshevik leaders.

"Comrade Zinoviev said: 'We must acknowledge what happened. It was a frame-up for power. The trick was to combine the old differences of opinion with new questions. For this 'Trotskyism' was invented...' (The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, p. 44. Our emphasis.)

Thus these traitors plotted and conspired, consciously and deliberately falsified Leninism and distorted the masses. Having poisoned the whole workers' state and the Comintern with Stalinist opportunism, Zinoviev and Kamenev stood at the head of the long roster of Stalinist criminals.

After Stalin crushed Zinoviev and Kamenev, these two ex-partners of his resorted to groveling in the dirt at his feet so as to ingratiate themselves with him. Trotsky describes the abject prostration of Zinoviev and Kamenev before Stalin in these words:

"After their capitulation, Zinoviev and Kamenev did absolutely everything they could in order to restore the confidence of the ruling clique in themselves and in order to be assimilated into the official milieu. Zinoviev...even

made attempts to burn incense to Stalin personally." (The Expulsion of Zinoviev, p. 55. Our emphasis.)

And so the wheel of history brought these two power-usurping plotters under the heel of the monster they created.

Clearly, this picture of Zinoviev and Kamenev drawn by Trotsky is one of two treacherous, self-seeking renegades who betrayed the cause of Bolshevism and, for the sake of personal power and bureaucratic autocracy, deliberately entered the criminal path of counter-revolution. And yet, there is the astounding fact that in the very same work in which he describes Zinoviev and Kamenev as doing everything possible to ingratiate themselves with the ruling clique, Zinoviev even making "attempts to burn incense to Stalin personally," Trotsky writes:

"Zinoviev and Kamenev tried to play tricks with history. Of course, they were motivated, first of all, by solicitude for the Soviet Union, for the unity of the party, and not at all for their personal welfare." (Ibid. p. 61-62. Our emphasis.)

After describing over a period of years the unbounded villainy of Zinoviev and Kamenev in their conspiracy for personal, bureaucratic power, Trotsky unflinchingly proclaims that "they were motivated, first of all, by solicitude for the Soviet Union, for the unity of the party, and not at all for their personal welfare." ! It would seem that their corruption of the Soviet Union with a malignant cancer of careerism, graft and bureaucratism constituted "solicitude for the Soviet Union." What was their frame-up of Trotsky, their invention of "Trotskyism," their malicious envy of his prestige and power? Why, obviously, that was their solicitude "for the unity of the party." And whence sprung the conspiracy of these tricksters to entrench themselves in power permanently and bureaucratically? Why, clearly, from their solicitude for the Soviet Union "and not at all for their personal welfare."

What reason could Trotsky have to splash this coat of whitewash on the degenerate carcasses of Zinoviev and Kamenev which were so deeply stained with the blood of millions of toilers they betrayed?

Obviously, Trotsky has a certain need to defend the Stalinist conspirators and to camouflage their actual criminality. This need arises from the fact that Trotsky, in an effort to form a partnership, a collective bureaucratic usurpation of power together with Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin, supported these renegades and grossed the path of their plot. Trotsky became implicated in the Stalinist conspiracy and remains irrevocably attached to Stalinism. On the other hand, the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin clique, striving to centralize power in their own claws and rejecting Trotsky's friendly overtures, destroyed his political power, thereby necessitating his adopting an "anti-Stalinist" front for his own self-protection from

this combination of circumstances arises Trotsky's unique methodology which comprises (1) ostensible "attacks" against Stalinism at the bottom of which lies (2) valuable support to Stalinism: Trotsky because of his implication in the Stalinist crime must protect Stalinism and prevent a genuine and complete exposure of the origin, development and nature of Stalinism, and the destruction of Stalinism this might lead to. Because of his role of perennial scape-goat and whipping-boy of the Stalinist conspirators, however, Trotsky, to save his own prestige, has to appear as an "anti-Stalinist." The outcome of this Trotskyist methodology is that Trotskyism has been serving, since the origin of Stalinism, as the chief trap by which the thousands of subjectively anti-Stalinist workers are tricked into supporting Stalinism.

J. C. H.
March 11, 1940.

WHY DID TROTSKY DENY THE EXISTENCE OF LENIN'S TESTAMENT?
WHAT WAS TROTSKY'S REAL ROLE IN THE STALINIST CONSPIRACY?

SEND FOR A FREE COPY OF -

TROTSKY
and the

SUPPRESSION
of

LENIN'S TESTAMENT

Address:

R. Rolene
P.O. Box 67
Station D
New York

ENGRAVING RADEK IN THE HEART
OF THE WORKINGCLASS

IN THE STALINIST REGENERATION of the Bolshevik Party, very few former revolutionists exhibited their opportunistic transformation in so pronounced a form as did Karl Radek. In his services to Stalinism there were some outstanding moments of his career.

In 1918 he aided the opportunist leaders of the German Communist Party, Brandler and Thälmann, to carry out the treacherous policy of coalition with Social Democrats through such Stalin, Mikoyan and other Stalin renegades betrayed the workers' cause. Later, during the period of the end of the Chinese revolution, he was fully conscious of the workers' cause and betrayed it. He was a spy for the future for the Chinese workers and peasants. When the time came for Kamenev to be expelled from the party, Radek, at that time a member of the "Left Opposition," expressed that Trotsky make a tactical bloc with Stalin against the minority faction. After Radek was expelled and exiled, he completely capitulated to Stalin, and, no longer in the guise of an "oppositionist," Radek continued his work of peddling Stalinist poison to the Russian masses and the world proletariat. Every day in the week and every week in the year, and year in and year out, Radek betrayed the workers in the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy. One of the most able of the Stalinist journalists, Radek made strenuous efforts to corrupt the workers with Stalinist vices. A particularly vile and fulsome piece of work in which Radek, with Byzantine flattery and hypocrisy, depicted his master, Stalin as building

socialism was his masterpiece, "The Architect of Socialist Society."

To cover up the demagogy of the bourgeoisie who were protesting they had completed the construction of socialism at a time when the masses of the Soviet Union looked even upon all-outlet socialism as a farce, Radek with brazen cynicism admitted that this is not socialism, but of a socialism. To the workers:-

"The country is not socialist!" we wrote in those days. "The country can not rise out of a famine or poverty. It is a struggle of millions of every day. Millions of lives are lost. The Soviet Union is not socialist! The country has entered into the period of socialist! Would it be possible to hope victoriously to complete the work of socialism? Karl Radek, was a prominent politician of the ruling Soviet circles, carried these remarks to the German liberal press. Emilinger-Baumgart, in a special issue devoted to the Soviet Union (May 1937), in the following words which deserve to be immortal: 'This is a product of cows and not of socialism, and you would have actually to confuse socialism with the image of a country where rivers flow milk, in order not to understand that a country can rise for a time to a higher level of development without any considerable rise in the material situation of the popular masses.' These lines were written when a horrible famine was raging in the country." (L. Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed, p. 51, 1937.)

Like all turncoats, but more so than many others, Radek played the Judas role toward his friends of yesterday among the "Oppositionists." Many years later, testifying before the Dewey Commission, Trotsky said the following about Radek:

"From the middle of 1929 Radek's name became, in the ranks of the Opposition, the symbol of the most degrading forms of capitulation and the knifing of yesterday's friends. The aforementioned Blumkin, in order to outline Stalin's difficulties more clearly, came ironically, 'Will he receive any aid from the renegade Radek?' To emphasize his contempt for the desertion of a recent capitulator, Blumkin said, 'You have cleared the way for the road to Radek!' The Case of Leon Trotsky, p. 229."

Radek's revolutionary past had long since receded into a dim memory. Making his own self with well-studied Bolshevikian dogma, Radek became the lowest type of desertion of the whole class. In view of the absence of the historical memory of this great revolution, it is impossible to recall his part in the current affair. We shall cite Trotsky's testimony once again. In order to see the picture clearly in the reader's mind we quote a passage of considerable length:

"Trotsky: Blumkin, a member of the Bolshevik Party and a former member of my military secretariat, was in Constantinople on an official mission.

Goldman: When?

Trotsky: In Constantinople, he visited me and also met my son in the street.

Goldman: In Constantinople?

Trotsky: In Constantinople. He took him to his room, to his hotel.

My son saw Blumkin. Blumkin said: 'I will see the old man.' My son came to me and said: 'He will see you.' I said, 'Absolutely impossible. It is too risky.' He insisted so that I had to accept, but very secretly. He went to Russia, to Moscow. Radek came from Siberia as a capitulator. He had absolute confidence in Radek — an old confidence.

Goldman: You mean Blumkin had?

Trotsky: Yes, Blumkin. He was younger than Radek. He visited him, and SAUL DENCHEV BLUMKIN IMMEDIATELY TO THE G.P.U.

Goldman: Radek visited Radek, and, according to your information, what did Blumkin say to Radek?

Trotsky: He informed him about his visit to me, on his own initiative. Because, if he had asked me about this visit, it would have been absolutely impossible for me to have said anything.

Goldman: What did Radek do after Blumkin informed him of his visit to you?

Trotsky: He thanked him for his visit to me.

Goldman: What happened to Blumkin?

Trotsky: HE WAS SHOT." (The Case of Leon Trotsky, pp. 155-6. My capitals - G.M.)

Radek kept up his work of loyally turning over his former friends into the clutches of Stalin's chief of the G.P.U., Yagoda. Suddenly, in the process of centralization of Stalin's power, during which a clearing of posts for new flunkys occurred, Stalin captured Radek and also Yagoda into his steel net. Radek figured in the frame-up Moscow Trial as a defendant.

It goes without saying that very

few people had a better knowledge and clearer understanding of Radek's counter-revolutionary Stalinist activity, than had Trotsky. Most of the revolutionary workers did not know of Radek's black deeds, but that cannot be said for Trotsky who, intimately connected with the Russian situation, familiarized himself throughout the years with Radek's pernicious activities. Yet, fully conscious of the fact that for a long stretch of time Radek served the cause of reaction, dancing in attendance to a bloody tyrant and aiding a wolfish bureaucracy to strangle the Russian masses, Trotsky, after Radek's trial, taught the workers to regard their long standing betrayer in the following light:

"No matter what one's attitude towards the defendants at the Moscow trials, no matter how one judges their conduct in the speeches of N. S. K. M., all of them — Zinoviev, Kamenev, Sklyanin, and many others — have by the whole course of their lives proved their disinterested devotion to the

sian people and their struggle for liberation." (L. Trotsky, Socialist Appeal, March 26, 1938. My emphasis and capitals — G.M.)

Such is the "Leninist education" that Trotsky was handing down to the uninformed, trusting revolutionary workers. The reason for such "education" is buried deep within Trotsky's true role in the Stalinist degeneration of the October Revolution. Some of the material throwing light upon his role we have given elsewhere. Trotsky himself gives a correct estimation of the nature of his "Bolshevik" methods. Trotsky knew quite well wherein lies the proof of the degeneration of a revolutionist. We read in his autobiography (p. 522) these appropriate words:

"There can be no greater proof of the intellectual downfall of a revolutionary politician than deception of the masses."

G. M.

January 5, 1941

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

When one studies the characters clustered around Stalin at the time when he was well advanced on his engineering career, one's attention is involuntarily arrested by an exceedingly striking passionate figure — Dzerzhinsky. From the very early stages of the Stalinization of the Soviet Union, Dzerzhinsky aided Stalin in carrying Lenin's program of worker's democracy and in entrenching the top echelons in solid control. The machi-

nations in Georgia against the anti-Stalinist Kdivani group were carried out in part by Dzerzhinsky as an ally of Stalin. In Lenin's letter on the National Question addressed to the Twelfth Congress there was a definite line proposed to the delegates to hold Stalin and Dzerzhinsky responsible for their opportunist policy:

"It is, of course, necessary to hold Stalin and Dzerzhinsky respon-

sible for all this out-and-out Great Russian nationalistic campaign." (quoted by L. Trotsky from Lenin's letter of December 31, 1920, in The Stalin School of Falsification, p. 66.)

Lenin's campaign against Stalin included a fight also against Stalin's close assistants, one of the most outstanding of whom was Dzerzhinsky. Trotsky testified in his autobiography:

"Lenin's offensive was directed not only against Stalin personally, but against his entire staff, and, first of all, his assistants, Dzerzhinsky and Ordzhonikidze." (L. Trotsky, My Life, p. 427. By emphasis - J.E.)

The Georgian journal accused Lenin in against Stalin and Dzerzhinsky. In a letter to Trotsky, Lenin stated that he could not trust Dzerzhinsky's impartiality in the Georgian case.

"At present, the case is under 'specialistic' consideration. Dzerzhinsky, who I suspect is not impartial, is the specialist." (quoted by L. Trotsky in My Life, p. 428.)

Indeed, Lenin was filled with indignation at the democratic accommodations of Stalin, Dzerzhinsky and other Stalinist bureaucrats, and so expressed himself in writing to the opponents of Stalin's policy in Georgia. Lenin's secretary brought a note to Trotsky which makes that clear.

"Kostyeva came to me again with a note from Lenin addressed to an old revolutionary, Mdivani, and to other opponents of Stalin's policy in Georgia. Lenin wrote to them: 'I am watching your case with all my heart and soul. Ordzhonikidze's rough methods and Stalin's and Dzerzhinsky's encouragement fill me with indignation. I am preparing notes and a speech for you.'" (Ibid. p. 434.)

Dzerzhinsky was one of those renegades who, as builders of the Stalinist bureaucracy, were among ^{the} foremost betrayers of Leninism. He climbed high to the upper stories of Stalin's tower of bureaucratism, and was placed at the head of the Supreme Economic Council of the Soviet Union, as a reward for his services to Stalin:

"Lenin's note promising the Georgian Bolsheviks his full support against Stalin, Dzerzhinsky, and Ordzhonikidze was addressed to Mdivani. The fates of the four reveal most vividly the sweeping change in the party engineered by the Stalin faction. After Lenin's death, Dzerzhinsky was put at the head of the Supreme Economic Council, that is, in charge of all state industries. Ordzhonikidze, who had been slated for expulsion, had been made the head of the Central Control Commission. Stalin not only has remained the general secretary, contrary to Lenin's wish, but has been given unprecedented powers by the apparatus. Finally, Mdivani, whom Lenin supported against Stalin, is now in the Control office." (Ibid. p. 509.)

Dzerzhinsky was particularly vicious against the opposition workers. In 1921 Dzerzhinsky was in the forefront removing anti-Stalin revolutionary workers from jobs, driving them to destitution and suicide. He supported Stalin in every major crime this renegade committed. He aided in suppressing Lenin's anti-Stalin documents, he lied without stint that the Stalin gang was building Socialism in Russia. The last speech which Dzerzhinsky delivered contained a fiery denunciation of the "Opposition."

"He died practically on his feet, just after he had left the platform from which he had so passionately been denouncing the opposition." (Ibid. p. 427.)

Dzerzhinsky had said that the Opposition would be dealt with in a

bloody fashion. Dzerzhinsky died at his Stalinist post, fighting for Stalin and the bureaucracy.

Every Stalinist bureaucrat expressed his deep grief over the loss of so valuable a fighter for the bureaucracy's interests. They lied to the masses that Dzerzhinsky died in service to the interests of the workers. Here is how Stalin deceived the workers:

"Knowing no rest, dodging no hard labor of any kind, contributing all his strength, all his energy to the cause, which the party entrusted to him - he turned out in tremendous work in the interests of the proletariat.

"Farewell, hero of our time! Farewell, true son of the party! Farewell, builder of white and night of our party!" (Travka, Pravda, July 1, 1926.)

There were many other workers who wrote in the same style about the Stalinist hero. Dzerzhinsky was not in Stalin's death. Dzerzhinsky was another victim of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The Stalinist bureaucracy was the enemy of the proletariat.

For his services, he was given the title of Hero of the Soviet Union and equally important title of Hero of the Proletariat. For his services, he was given the title of Hero of the Soviet Union and Hero of the Proletariat. There was no other field in which he could have been, however it always worked in the very same field: in the front line of his party and his class, breaking the path to the future, first demolishing the old society and then laying the foundation for the new.

Who wrote these deceptive words? Kallinin? Molotov? Voroshilov? This commendation of the character and services of the deceased, loyal lieu-

tenant of Stalin was written by — Leon Trotsky!

The illusion is widespread that Trotsky fought for Leninism against the destroyers of Leninism, i.e., against Stalin and his Dzerzhinskys. In his obituary for Dzerzhinsky, which was printed in the Pravda for the workers to read, Trotsky whitewashed this destroyer of Leninism and of the opposition workers. Moreover, Trotsky in strong commendation of Dzerzhinsky told the workers that the bureaucrat who died in the service of the Stalinist reaction was a fortune for them:

"The word death does not tie itself with this exceptional end — in the struggle, on the move, after a hard speech. Dzerzhinsky did not die, he became transformed. And he continued with obvious hatred of the old, but a still greater fiery love of the new. He, descending from his seat, entered forever into history.

His name was Felix, and Felix is a very fortunate one. And his life was a fortune — a fortune for the class which he served, for the party to which he belonged, and a fortune for the Soviet Union. (L. Trotsky, Pravda, July 1, 1926.)

The only good fortune for the proletariat would have been if Lenin had lived to crush Stalin, Dzerzhinsky and all other allies of the usurper of power. Unfortunately for the workers, and fortunately for Stalin and the international bourgeoisie, Lenin did not live to see the full flowering of Dzerzhinsky's opportunism and to read Trotsky's hypocritical obituary of that Stalinist bureaucrat.

G. M.

January 5, 1941

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

Shachtman's Magic Pen

AVELI YENUKIDZE was for years one of the most loyal of Stalin's henchmen. Since the origin of the Stalinist conspiracy and up to the very day he fell in disfavor with the powerful Usurper, Yenukidze shared in Stalin's crimes. A Georgian himself, having some influence in Georgia, he used it to aid Stalin in framing up and sending to their doom many revolutionists, among them Maivani and Zinzadze the leading Bolsheviks in Georgia who were supported by Lenin against Stalin on the National Question. Yenukidze actively participated in making Trotsky a scapegoat. He voted for Trotsky's expulsion from the Party and later aided Stalin to exile Trotsky to Alma Ata, consequently helping Stalin to exile Trotsky from the Soviet Union. Together with Stalin, this renegade and cutthroat decimated, exiled, wiped out in blood thousands of anti-Stalinist workers. On the international field, Yenukidze helped Stalin to betray the German, Chinese and other workers. He did not stay his hand at the blackest deeds in the service of the Stalinist degeneration.

The true character of this man was no mystery to Trotsky and the Trotskyite leaders. In his introduction to Trotsky's work, The Stalin School of Falsification p. xvi, Max Shachtman correctly describes Yenukidze as loyal servitor of the Stalinist bureaucracy:

"Aveli Yenukidze, who succeeded Lutovinov in his post, and retained it for more than a decade, was suddenly removed in 1935 and imprison-

ed — with the whispered charges that this man, who had been so loyal a servitor of the bureaucracy for years, had participated in the plot to kill S. M. Kirov." (My emphasis - R.R.)

But Trotsky and his lieutenants seem to have a soft spot for every Stalinist flunkie, who, victim of his own criminality, is finally ground down by the iron heel of the Master. Thus, when Yenukidze, having assisted Stalin to frame Zinoviev and Kamenev, paid with his own life, Shachtman made an amazing "discovery":

"Aveli Yenukidze, another old revolutionist whose whole life was given to the cause of the working class." (Socialist Appeal, December 1937. My emphasis - R.R.)

With a stroke of the pen, Shachtman converts Yenukidze from a renegade who spent years in Stalin's bloody services into a person: "whose whole life was given to the cause of the working class."

However, no amount of crocodile tears can blur the decades-long counter-revolutionary record of the old traitor Yenukidze; just as no amount of ink can conceal the fact that Trotsky, at one time a revolutionist, became a Stalinist traitor to Lenin and the proletariat as far back as 1921-1922. And no amount of lying can change the truth that Trotskyism is but a political branch of the House of Stalin and Co.

R. R.

THE TROTSKY SCHOOL OF FALSIFICATION

THE POLITICAL MORALS
OF THE
TROTSKYITE LEADERS

NOT only to revolutionary workers, but even to average persons there is hardly anything more impressive in the pronouncements of political figures than their ability to make correct prognoses of the future course of development of historical events. Indeed, if anything, there is a tendency to overestimate the significance of such prognoses, for they do not in themselves prove the correctness of a political system. All the founders of Marxism at one time or another made inaccurate prognoses, yet their political system is the only one true for the working class. There is nothing particularly reprehensible about making false prognoses and predictions, for genuine leaders of the working class, who must of necessity be honest, will acknowledge and mend their errors. An effort to conceal or deny false prognoses, on the other hand, is a mark of the charlatan and opportunist, and a policy of assuring the workers that predictions and analyses which history disproved are correct is a true sign of conscious deception.

* * *

IN the voluminous writings of Leon Trotsky, even if one confines oneself to the period of Stalinism from 1922 on, one will find a host of prognoses dealing with major problems of politics. Some of them are correct, some are false. It is not the degree of accuracy of Trotsky's prognoses in itself that we are con-

cerned with here. We deal here with the attitude of the Trotskyist leadership toward these prognoses, for in this attitude there is to be found a measure of the political morals of the Trotskyist leadership. That Trotsky made false prognoses on major political problems can be easily established. We shall first list a number of them and then cite the attitude of the Trotskyist leadership toward them. Whether that attitude is one characteristic of genuine working class leaders or of opportunists will be self-evident.

* * *

IN the period of the rule of the Trio, Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev, the greatest political problem facing the capitalists was the profound revolutionary crisis in Germany in 1923. To the immeasurable detriment of the working class, the leadership of the German Communist Party was already Stalinized and pursuing a counter-revolutionary policy. The Trio's puppets in the German Party, Brandler and Thalheimer, following the ultra-Rightist course set down by the renegade Stalinist leadership of the Comintern, were participating in and supporting a bourgeois government consisting principally of social-democratic agents of German imperialism. Through this policy, the Stalinist traitors were stifling the revolutionary upsurge of the workers.

In October 1933, in a speech delivered in public before a meeting of Moscow workers, Trotsky made the following prognosis:-

"In this respect circumstances favor the working class of Germany. They are ready for the struggle, and in order to act they must know that at their head stands a party ready to lead them from struggle to struggle and to final victory... Events are developing as if according to a plan. If all the signs of the struggle do not deceive us we may expect that in the near future power will go over into the hands of the working class." (Reported in Pravda on October 21, 1933, and quoted as given here in The Worker, U.S.A., Dec. 1, 1933. My emphasis — J.C.H.)

History is the witness to the utter falsity of this prognosis. The German working class, due to the treachery of Stalinism, was smashed in October 1933. Power remained in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

* * *

UPON the advent of Hitler to power, Trotsky painted this rainbow for the workers to gaze at:-

"It would be patently stupid to believe that the subsequent evolution of Germany will go the Italian road; that Hitler will strengthen his domination step by step without serious resistance." (The Militant, April 8, 1933.)

Contrary to Trotsky's prognosis, Hitler strengthened his domination step by step without serious resistance, indeed, with virtually no resistance, for the German masses were totally paralyzed by their treacherous leadership.

The Trotskyite leaders gave "reasons" for their prognosis that the Nazis would not be able to consolidate their dictatorship. It would seem, according to the Trotskyists, that the situation favored the German workers,

for they had at their head something to which the Trotskyite leaders referred as a "most powerful Communist party":-

"It is entirely unthinkable that the German working class, millions strong, trained in the school of the class struggle for years, having at its head the most powerful Communist [sic!] party in the world outside the Soviet Union, will permit the Nazi assassins to remain in power without a violent struggle." (The Militant, February 4, 1933.)

Although it was "entirely unthinkable," the German proletariat, for many years in the clutches of the counter-revolutionary Social Democracy and Stalinism, was too demoralized and disoriented to put up a struggle against the Nazis. Again the Trotskyist prognosis was utterly false.

* * *

IN line with the above prognosis and in the same period, Trotsky predicted that the German bourgeoisie would not hand over the actual power to Hitler and his Nazi hordes. Trotsky alleged that a move to hand over power to Hitler would provoke a civil war with problematic outcome:

"There is no way of getting around without the Nazis. But it is likewise impossible to give over to them the actual power; today, the threat on the part of the proletariat is not so acute that the higher-ups should consciously provoke a civil war with problematic outcome." (Leon Trotsky, The Militant, February 24, 1933.)

It should be noted that this prognosis was made after Hitler was already appointed Chancellor! History again disproved Trotsky's predictions. On June 22, 1933, the Nazis outlawed all political parties other than the National Socialist Party. By August 1934 the consolidation of all power in the hands of the Nazis was symbolized in the elevation of Hitler to the

position of "Führer."

* * *

PRIOR to Hitler's rise to power, Trotsky made a prognosis regarding the German workers' ability to fight the fascists. In December 1931, Trotsky told the workers the following:

"We are unshakably convinced that the victory over the Fascists is possible — not after their coming to power, not after five, ten or twenty years of their rule, but now, under the given conditions, in the coming months and weeks." (Germany, "The Key to the International Situation, p. 31. My emphasis — J.C.H.)

The "given conditions," both "now" and "in the coming months and weeks," were those of the control of the German proletarian vanguard by the Stalinist renegades and by Social Democracy. Yet, despite Trotsky's "unshakable conviction" that under such conditions "the victory over the Fascists is possible," he again proved to be wrong. The given conditions presented only a sure defeat for the masses and the victory of Fascism.

* * *

FOR years Trotsky taught the workers to believe that it was possible to reform the Stalinized "Comintern" and set it back on the course the Comintern had under Lenin's leadership. Trotsky's thesis was that because the Soviet Union is a Workers State, it was not necessary to destroy the Stalinist regime and build a new Bolshevik Party, for, he said, it was POSSIBLE to reform the Stalinist organization into a Bolshevik body:

"The recognition of the present Soviet State as a workers' state not only signifies that the

bourgeoisie can conquer power in no other way than by an armed uprising but also that the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. has not forfeited the POSSIBILITY of submitting the bureaucracy to it, of reviving the party again and of mending the regime of the dictatorship — without a new revolution, with the methods and on the road of reform." (Draft Thesis of the International Left Opposition on the Russian Question, 1931, p. 36. Emphasis in the original. Caps ours — J.C.H.)

This prognosis was another myth. History irrefutably teaches that the deadly Stalinist cancer gnawing at the vitals of the Soviet Union, the bureaucratic regime of the dictatorship, and the powerful instrument of this bureaucratic regime, "the party," can be eliminated only through the method of a new revolution, a forcible action by the workers. Along this line of "reforming" the Stalinized Soviet Union, Trotsky asserted emphatically that the "Comintern" sufficed for the needs of the "Opposition" and that the latter would triumph in the "Comintern." Trotsky's prognosis was that—

".... the Opposition needs no other channel than that of the Comintern. No one will succeed in tearing us away from it. The ideas we defend will become its ideas. They will find their expression in the program of the Communist International." (Third International After Lenin, p. 166.)

No one will deny that the Trotskyites stopped calling themselves a faction of the "Comintern," and declaring for complete independence from it, set up a "Fourth International." As everybody knows, the "Comintern" never accepted Trotsky's ideas which are that he represents Leninism and that Stalin represents opportunism.

* * *

WE have presented a series of Trotsky's false prognoses on some of the most outstanding political

problems of the present historical period. These prognoses were made over a period of years ranging from 1923 to 1933. One of the above prognoses, that the Soviet State and the "Comintern" could be reformed, constituted a thesis which was fundamental in Trotsky's entire political system. This prognosis, in Trotsky's formulations, was said to govern the existence of the Trotsky movement as a "faction of the Comintern." This prognosis was given by Trotsky as the basis for urging "critical" support to the Stalinist organizations including the "Comintern." The falsity of this prognosis was proof that under Trotsky's leadership the anti-Stalinist workers had been sent on a wild goose chase. Now, then, did the Trotsky leadership react to the refutation by history of their false prognoses? Did it take the course of honest, genuine leaders of the working class or that of charlatans and opportunists?

In October 1934, during the crucial period when the Trotsky movement was shifting its line, the Enlarged Plenum of the L.C.I. stated:-

"There has been no major question on which the analysis and prognosis of the Bolshevik-Leninists [i.e., the Trotskyists - J.C.H.] have not been confirmed." (Declaration of Enlarged Plenum of L.C.I., October 1934.)

Here is a clear-cut example of the demagogic effort of the Trotsky leadership to conceal the deadly character

of the false analyses and prognoses it had been giving the workers. The affectation of infallibility on major questions was so strenuously exaggerated precisely because there was so much guilt to conceal. The above specimen of pretentious self-inflation was not an isolated case. Several months before, the Trotsky leadership on another occasion proclaimed:-

"The CORRECTNESS of our methods, our PREDICTIONS and our slogans have been incontestably proved through the entire historic development of the last ten years, that is, the period of the degeneration and decay of the Communist International." (Statement of the International Secretariat of the League of Communist-Internationalists, The Militant, March 31, 1934. My capitals - J.C.H.)

As we have indicated before, there is nothing criminal in making a mistake in analysis and prognosis. But it is downright dishonesty to palm off wrong predictions as correct. The above statement, in a wholesale, sweeping, most brazen manner does precisely that. With this deception and trickery fashioned in the typical style of Stalinist bureaucrats, Trotsky's "Fourth International" was launched. On the basis of such conscious and deliberate fraud, it exists today and continues its function of misleading the workers.

J. C. Hunter
August 27, 1941